

THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. CX.—OCT., 1862.

THE PLACE OF BAPTISTS IN PROTESTANT CHRISTENDOM.*

[BY PROF. GEO. R. BLISS, OF THE UNIVERSITY AT LEWISBURG, PA.]

The relation truly subsisting between our Baptist policy and the characteristic principle of Protestantism, is the theme to which I venture to call your attention at this time. A topic not so strictly suitable, perhaps, for the hearing of this society, as the one which I should have been glad to discuss had not Providence disturbed the leisure necessary for extended historical researches.

Yet I have named a subject not without intrinsic interest, as it seems to me, and worthy, if it were a proper occasion, of deliberate consideration. At a time when liveliest among all the agitations of Christendom, the battle of religious ideas is waging everywhere; when, in thoughtful minds, its turmoil ceases not even amid the uproar of that Titanic strife which racks our own convulsed land; when some of the dearest interests of humanity are involved in the struggle between

*An Address Delivered before the American Baptist Historical Society at Providence, May 30th, 1862.

Scripture and tradition, between Christian and Church, between spiritual liberty and prescription, between the progress of God's kingdom in Church and State and a conservatism which is in truth retrogression, who can be content without ascertaining his own position in the mighty arena, and the responsibility which it infers? This we do summarily as Baptists, when we inquire after our exact relation to the principle of Protestantism which, since its introduction to the Christian world, has been the chief leaven of all the salutary fermentation of humanity.

It is not unlikely that to many that relation will appear so obvious as scarcely to require investigation. Even so, however, the practical bearings of it, its special proportion to our time and circumstances, might not be undeserving of thought. But how can the relation itself be palpable to most of us, when not only is the real nature of Protestantism in dispute among leading authorities, but when, also, some of them positively deny to us in any worthy sense a protestant character. When, for instance, so excellent a man as Dr. Philip Schaf, the able, learned, and pious professor at Mercersburg, Pa., expressly, in his book on Protestantism,* puts Baptists out of the circle of its proper exponents, among the "diseases" of Protestantism — allowing to "Anabaptism" with other "sects," only a partial and transient value, as indicative to the church (the true Protestant Church, whatever that may be) of some inconsistency or defect. Dr. Nevin and other writers — not to mention speakers — of the Mercersburg school, are still more exclusive; and, without stopping to point out other conspiring tendencies of antipathy to our policy, I would simply ask whether much which Baptists meet with at the hands of good men in various parts of the world, does not presume, for its justification, such a theory of our position. This I say not at all in the tone of deprecation or complaint, only let the principle of their opposition be distinctly seen and averred.

* "The Principle of Protestantism in relation to the present state of the Church." By PHILIP SCHAF, Ph. D. Translated from the German, with an Introduction, by JOHN W. NEVIN, D. D.

Indeed, many Baptists would, I suppose, just as vehemently repel the imputation of Protestantism (on the assumption of their prior and independent origin) as such churchly writers would forefend from them the honor. Yet not all of us, surely, would be willing to forego participation in the history, the achievements, the glory, or the responsibilities of the Protestant name. And this further illustrates the necessity of a careful investigation.

To determine, then, the relation between us and it, two courses are open to us. We may either examine critically the genetic principles of both members of the relation — the *comparanda*; or, we may notice the circumstances and order of their origin in historical fact. The former is the more satisfactory method, and we must, for want of time, now depend principally on that.

Here the chief difficulty will be to ascertain the very essence of Protestantism. How it was brought about is not doubtful. By what succession of experiences and deeds Martin Luther and others were conducted, early in the sixteenth century, from the gloom of Popish bondage to the light and liberty of evangelical truth, may be read in a thousand books. But this, although the precursor to Protestantism, and its actual occasion, was not Protestantism itself, and might, conceivably, have taken place without being followed by that particular result. Much confusion has originated, as I am obliged to think, from a habit of perplexing Protestantism with Reformation. Is not this an error of Dr. Schaf himself, who, after beginning, in the work before mentioned, to speak of the "principle of Protestantism," proceeds to enucleate, as if it were the same thing, the "principle of the reformation"? This latter he correctly enough makes to be (in a two-fold aspect) *materially* the doctrine of free justification to the believing sinner before God for Christ's sake, and *formally* the authority of the Scriptures as the source and measure of all saving truth. This is then tacitly assumed as an adequate description of Protestantism. Similar statements of its nature, equivalent in their purport and vitiated by the same fault, must be familiar to all. Indeed, such would, I suppose,

be quite generally accepted as *just definitions*, not of reformation, which they may be, but of Protestantism, which is really another thing. And as to any denominational consequences to follow, I see not why we should be suspicious of them more than others. But when we seek for the exact truth, this confounding of things which differ is not satisfactory, nor is it sustained by the teachings of the ablest recent writers of church history.*

Reformation may be thought of entirely apart from Protestantism. The former may be imagined to have gone on quietly and peaceably, its spirit to have been cherished, its doctrines to have been apprehended, its life to have been lived, as has been the case in many a devout heart throughout all ages. We may conceive it to have wrought like the leaven, in secret, or, if openly yet so gently, so patiently, so purely, that there should have been transformation at last without, at any time, a protest or a revolution. In short, the reformers *might* have proceeded as Protestant Churchmen think those among themselves desiring amendment ought to do, careful above all things that the body, called of Christ, should not be broken. But suppose them to prefer a different course. Suppose them unwilling, secretly or individually alone, to hold the great truth of gratuitous salvation through Christ, and of the autoeracy of Scripture, and resolved on *publishing* their belief, exemplifying it in practice, and making it effective through organic association, through Church fellowship, in short; and suppose them to be met now by the assertion that however it might be with their particular truths, the power of the church was paramount, and that the church — the State too, if you please — forbade their procedure; then must they either yield, recant, suppress their cherished sentiments, and even obediently suffer the discipline of sacred mother church, or they must find a standing ground back of their primary and palpable doctrines, a first truth of church building, and *that* will be the principle of Protestantism.

Now to discover what that really is, it would seem to be a

* See, e. g., Hase, History of the Christian Church, § 374, Am. Translation.

helpful thing to notice what the Reformers did in becoming Protestants. In their protest itself, which marks the transition, we should, reasonably, as D'Aubigne says we do, find "the principles that constitute the very essence of Protestantism."* What then do they here say? The occasion was, as will be remembered, when the second Diet of Speier, A. D. 1529, representing both Church and State, had decreed by a majority to qualify, not utterly abolish, the liberty, three years before conceded to each state, of administering religious affairs "as they might severally answer to God and their own conscience." Against this mere *toleration* of the reformed principles within the limits to which they had then spread, and within which they could not conveniently be suppressed, certain members of the Diet, unwilling to hamstring their new-found gospel, PROTESTED; and here is what, among other things, they say: "We protest and engage publicly before God and man, that our will, disposition, and meaning not otherwise stands nor is, than to seek only the honor of God Almighty, of his holy word, and the salvation also of our individual souls, and in this to do nothing else than what *our conscience* directs and teaches." Again: "We form no judgment on what concerns you, most dear lords, and are content to pray God daily, that he will bring us all to unity of faith in truth, charity, and holiness, through Jesus Christ, our throne of grace, and our only Mediator; but in what concerns ourselves, adhesion to your resolution would be acting *against our conscience*, condemning a doctrine which we maintain to be Christian,"† etc. In "all dutiful and possible things" they profess cordial submissiveness to the emperor and the realm; "but these," say they, "are matters which pertain to and affect God's glory and the salvation of every one of our souls, in which, upon God's command, *for our conscience's sake*, we are pledged and bound, through baptism and otherwise, by his divine word, to regard him, our Lord and God, as King supreme and Lord of all lords." They

* History of the Reformation, Vol. IV. p. 69, Carter's Ed.

† This quotation is from D'Aubigne, Hist. of Ref., Vol. IV. p. 67.

reiterate "that in things concerning God's honor and the salvation of our souls, every one must stand and give account for himself before God, so that, in this matter, no one can excuse himself upon another's doing or decreeing more or less, and not be bound to act from other sound, well established reasons." They added, "we cannot, with *good conscience*, hold and fulfil the imperial edict in all points, since we could not at all answer for it before God to separate any one of high or low degree, by our joint resolution, from the doctrine which we, out of the evident intimation of God's eternal word, hold, undoubtingly, to be divine and Christian, and *against our own conscience* to force them under the edict in question." When advised to submit themselves, in the interpretation of Scripture, to the judgment of the "Church," they reply, that would answer well, if we were agreed what is the true, holy Christian Church. But since in regard to that there is not a little strife, and since there is no certain sermon or doctrine, but alone to abide by God's word, . . . and there to compare and explain one text of sacred Scripture by another, as also the same holy Scripture, in all points needful for the Christian man to know, is found in itself clean and pure to enlighten all darkness; we are minded with the gracious help of God to hold fast finally to this, that God's word alone, and the holy gospel in the Old and New Testaments contained, shall be preached purely and simply, and nothing contrary thereto; for on that as on the only truth and the right measure of all Christian doctrine and life can no man err or fail, and he who builds and abides thereon shall stand against all the gates of hell, while all human additions and vanity shall fall and not stand before God."*

* The above citations from the *Protestatio* of the Reformers at Speier (as incorporated and expanded in their *Instrumentum Appellationis*) are translated principally from the extracts given by Schenkel, in his article on Protestantism, in Herzog's theologische Real-Encyclopädie, Vol. XII. It was a matter of great surprise to me, considering the obvious importance of this document, to discover how rarely it is to be met with. Having searched in vain several considerable libraries, public and private, for the works commonly referred to, as containing it, I came unexpectedly on the contemporary German

There breathes the soul of Protestantism, whatever may have been the stages of experience by which the Reformers were brought to witness that good confession. Here they have taken ground, and manifestly the only ground on which they can maintain justification by faith, and whatever else they learn from God's Word, against prince, church, pope and devil. It is not any particular doctrine of their faith which here stands out. It is not even the sufficiency of Scripture for religious government and guidance, primarily, but that secondarily, and as complementary to the great cardinal principle of the right of conscience on which the whole system of Protestantism turns. THE SANCTITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE implying both its *inviolableness*, in religious concerns, before all earthly powers, civil or ecclesiastical, and its *obligation* to cherish and proclaim its convictions—that is the *primum mobile* of Protestantism.

In favor of this summary interpretation of the ever memorable protest of A. D. 1529, I might allege the authority of Dr. Merle,* at least against those who, like Dr. Schaf, relegate freedom of conscience to an inferior place in the scheme of Protestantism, of Hase† and others. But I refer with especial satisfaction to the support which I find in this view, the guidance, indeed, of Daniel Schenkel‡ one of the most learned and ablest, as well as most pious and candid writers on the genius and fortunes of Protestantism. As I am indebted to his extracts for most of the quotations which I gave from the

translation of the Latin original in Walch's Edition of Luther's writings, where he gives matter pertaining to the second Diet of Speier. This I state as suggesting a query whether it is the oversight of the protest which has blinded many writers to the true character and relations of Protestantism, or a prejudice concerning the latter which has made it inconvenient to bring the protest too conspicuously into notice.

* Hist. of the Ref., Vol. IV., p. 69.

† History of the Christian Church, p. 338.

‡ For a brief sketch of this author see Dr. Schaf's Germany; its Universities Theology and Religion, p. 402. Two distinct works on the nature of Protestantism are ascribed to him, but I have seen only his article in the Real-Encyclopädie before referred to, which, as being his latest utterance, may be supposed to give his mature judgment in the matter.

Protest of the Reformers made the 19th of April, or their Appeal dated six days later, so I agree perfectly with him as to their significance. Schenkel's conclusion is, that "the deepest source of that protestation is the newly awakened consciousness of the *eternal rights of conscience*. Friends and foes," he says, "have indicated subjectivity as the most striking and characteristic feature of Protestantism. And it is indeed the right of the believing subject which opposes the objective institution, ecclesiastical and civil, and defends itself against it, when the latter with the form of law would control and limit faith Protestantism is therefore a great deed of Conscience. Its most general character is that of religion in the form of conscientious conviction, . . . in the form of freedom of conscience. That is its *formal* aspect. In whatever confession or church institution this freedom is not recognized, that is anti-protestant."

This principle, although plainly the only one on which there could ever be emancipation from the Romish hierarchy, is doubtless liable to abuse. It is abused whenever men destitute of the Christian spirit assume the guise and steal the terms of Protestantism, or when men of any character employ them in any other interest than to defend and to promote the whole truth of God. Protestantism is not mere protestation. It is the profession by the Christian soul of its untrammelled, simple, supreme devotion to that God whom the conscience recognizes, loves, adores.

Hence we may see the propriety and necessity of that other declaration, scarcely less prominent on the face of the great Protest, of absolute submission to the word of God. This might, at a superficial glance, seem inconsistent with the liberty which its authors primarily claim, a sort of *contradictio in adjecto*. But it is rather the necessary complement to that, an essential factor to the whole truth.

Christianly religious conscientiousness is, as we have seen, the *form* of Protestantism; but the *substance* of all vital religion is God in the soul.* In order to this God must

* See some thoughts in this and the following paragraph developed in an interesting way by Schenkel, as above quoted.

reveal himself to the soul. And since the Inspired Word comprehends, or presumes and supplements all other modes and results of divine revelation, *it* is the only full and sufficient apocalypse of God. Conscience, which is the eye of the soul towards divine things, accordingly hails God manifested in the Bible, and while brooking no other dictation, accepts these communications of Him as the very light of its life.

It has sometimes been represented that the Reformers, feeling the need of some solid fortress from which they could resist the attack of an infallible Papacy, luckily hit upon the dogma of the supremacy of Scripture—the Bible against the Church—the written Word against tradition. But I perceive no trace of contrivance or after-thought in their original declaration as Protestants. The imperial authority of Scripture is no dogma here; it is a principle. It is not a principle distinct from and additional to that of freedom of conscience, so as to be restrictive of it; but, as I before said, explicative rather, and necessary to fulfil it. It was as if they felt instinctively that there can be no genuine freedom except in absolute submission to the terms of created being. Conscience, as the soul's eye towards God and God's witness to the soul, is free, exists, indeed, only in Him; that is, for this world, only in the most perfect manifestation which He has made of Himself to men; that is, in the Sacred Scriptures. The two different aspects of the Protestant principle are, therefore, while standing towards each other *as* Protestant in the order above given, *only* aspects, the obverse and reverse of the same medal, opposite poles of one sphere, ends of a single chain, of which he who seizes the first is sure to draw the other after it. There is, there can be, no exclusive authority of the Bible where conscience is not free, and there is only the insanity of caprice, not freedom, where the Bible is rejected.

I would only add, before leaving this branch of my subject, that while I have found it convenient to dwell on the origin of Protestantism, as historically reported in Germany, and particularly as brought to light in its inaugural documents, the same view of its essence might be soundly established on other grounds, and in reference to any other country where it has ever arisen.

Now I am sure you would feel it a supererogatory task for me to attempt an elaborate proof that the fundamental principle of Protestantism is the fundamental principle of Baptist Christianity as such. Not only does every heart here leap up now to greet every word of that noble protestation which you have heard, adopting it as a principle, without reserve, qualification or addition, but we know that none holding our views in other respects ever could have failed to rejoice in such declarations. It would not, probably, make this conviction clearer to a single mind, if I were to show that every notable confession of a Baptist church or individual agrees in spirit with one of ancient time which happens to lie before me * and which calmly says that "Holy Scripture is the rule whereby saints, both in matters of faith and conversation, are to be regulated;" and, again, "that it is the will and mind of God (in these gospel times) that all men should have the free liberty of their own consciences, in matters of religion or worship, without the least oppression or persecution, as simply on that account." That noble specimen of soul liberty given by Roger Williams, here in Rhode Island, for ever honorable as the first open "shelter" on earth "for persons distressed of conscience," was only a symptom of the Baptist sentiment already prevailing, and might have been no marvel to the world, had Christians of that name been earlier in a position to determine the civil institutions of a land. Not clearer in our hearts, at this noon of the nineteenth century, shines the central axiom of every soul's right to worship and serve God untrammelled, than it shone to each Baptist confessor through the long night of persecution in centuries past.

To Roger Williams is rightly ascribed the glory of having first wrought out this principle *ad unguem*, and given definiteness as well as amplitude to the Baptist idea. But to *any* Baptist mind the only difficulty likely to have been felt with the original statement of the Protestants, would be on account of its want of breadth and completeness. It confines itself, formally, to the *Christian's* right of conscience, although the

* In Crosby's History of the Baptists, Vol. III., App. No. IV. p. 87. Lond. 1739.

universal franchise of the mind demonstrably lies latent in that ; and while they nobly declare that their act was "not only in behalf of themselves, but also of their people, and of all who then or afterwards might believe in the word of God," we receive from it a shade of impression (perhaps wholly cast on it by their subsequent course) that they were indulging a sort of representative and legislative freedom of conscience to bind the people for whom they spoke. Still, they said all, if interpreted simply, which the case of the first Protestants required. The irresponsibility of conscience to any earthly tribunal was with them, as we may say, a happy instinct, aroused by their present exigency, but unaccounted for, and unheeded beyond that. With the Baptists it had not only been suggested by their like occasions, but long *thought out*, justified and followed through its bearings on the religious and civil interests of mankind. With the one it was, in short, and remained, a *principle* (alas ! too soon forgotten); with the other, it had become a *doctrine* for the whole world.

So strictly is the generative principle of the Baptist polity identical with that of Protestantism that it is extremely doubtful whether, if the latter had been practically honored by the first reformers in different countries, the Baptists, as a distinct body in Christendom, would have ever been heard of. But those men, while asserting a truth which heralded a boundless development of divine knowledge and a perpetual amendment of ecclesiastical institutions, had no conscious aim further than to gain a defence for their momentary position. This accomplished, they immediately proceeded to establish themselves there for ever. Hase, representing the recent historians, says well, that so far were the first protestants from perceiving the true drift of their movement, "in the midst of the excitement of their internal and external conflicts of faith, that from the convent of Berg and the synod of Dordrecht, the Protestant Church appears only like a purified form of Catholicism. In various ways it practically represented itself as infallible, and even expressly claimed that there was no salvation out of itself."* Yet these churches, while professing

* Hist. of the Church, p. 438.

the spirituality of religion, the sanctity of church-membership, and the sole authority of the Bible, assumed to comprehend within themselves the whole people of their several countries, irrespective of age, character, or religious experience—a mass of ignorance and moral corruption which filled serious men even then with dismay, and made Luther, in particular, pronounce Germany worse than Sodom, mourning that he spoke the language. And when certain men, perceiving this inconsistency and iniquity, strove to reform the church-constitutions, or even to adapt their own practice more nearly to the acknowledged pattern of the New Testament, they were contemned, rebuked, persecuted, often slain, and every where sooner or later cast out. *Thus* arose the line of modern Baptists.*

Their divergence from the path of the first Protestant churches was, accordingly, not at all because of dissatisfaction with the originally avowed principles of the latter, but because they adhered too strictly to those principles in their application to Christian life and church polity. They perfectly agreed with all lovers of the gospel in regard to the justification of the sinner by faith alone through Christ. They might vary among themselves touching most of the distinc-

* This is not to deny the indisputable fact that there existed at different times during most of the Christian ages, among the so-called heretical sects, those who agreed in points more or less with Baptists now. But in judging whether they should be *called* Baptists (at times when all practised immersion) one ought to note precisely what distinguishes the regular Baptist among the various bodies now denying birthright church-membership. Otherwise he may be in danger of identifying us with "Christians," Campbellites, "Quakers," "Old School Baptists," and no man knows what, among the ancient sects.

At all events, I suppose that our existing Baptist organizations, so far as their origin is traceable, are pretty clearly due to conversions, in the way of a secondary Protestantism, from Romish or Pædobaptist principles. See, in illustration of this, a valuable article on Early Modern Baptists, in the January No. of the *Christ. Review* for 1862. I know not whether the research of our scholars has developed a single link of genealogical connection between our existing churches and the Anabaptists (for "Baptists," of course, there were nominally none) in Luther's time and earlier. And I am free to say that I consider curiosity in such "endless genealogies" so much in danger of misleading many in regard to the essentials of ecclesiastical legitimacy that even if a line of continuous derivation *could* be made out for us from the apostles, I had almost rather it *should* not.

tions between the Lutherans and the Reformed. They went beyond all these in maintaining, on Scriptural grounds, the independence of each Christian congregation, not only before the civil magistrate, but equally before any ecclesiastical power, the universal priesthood of believers, also, and the consequent impossibility of sacerdotal holiness or clerical preëminence in their eldership. As, however, several of these tenets were early shared also by the Independents, they can scarcely be named as characteristic of the Baptist system. Nor did the mode of the administration of baptism constitute at first so marked a peculiarity as since. This naturally occasioned less discussion when the apostolical and hereditary practice was still much in vogue—only obsolescent at the most. Indeed not all the better Anabaptists appear to have insisted on immersion, and many who did so, down even to our day, were not Baptists. But the real mark, the *differentia*, of modern Baptists among evangelical Christians was their steadfast denial of infant church-membership, or birth-right church-membership, on any account—demanding, rather, that evidence of that faith which all declared essential to Christianity should be afforded before the reception of Christian ordinances, or participation in church fellowship. This position they adopted, avowedly, because they were conscientiously shut up to it by the palpable requirements of God's word. And that *they* should, on this account, be compelled, against men, holding with the apostle that whatsoever in religion is not of faith is sin,* to cherish at the cost of fines, imprisonment, confiscation, exile, death in the most terrific forms, their belief of the invalidity of Christian ordinances to unbelieving subjects, is, after making all candid allowance, one of the most melancholy instances of the inconsistency and intolerance of poor human nature.

Let me call particular attention to the fact that in all this our predecessors broke with the other Reformers, not on grounds of doctrine, strictly so called, but of church constitution. Herein, also, appears their fidelity to the motives of

* See D'Aubigne, Vol. IV. rp. 71.

Protestantism. For although the Reformers meant it not so, what they were principally accomplishing was the demolition of that old church which, whatever had been its services to God's providence in other days, had now become the Bastile of captive souls. While directly concerned about great life-truths of morality and religion, they less clearly saw that it was more, much more, an ecclesiastical than a theological or doctrinal reformation which they had inaugurated. It was against the pretensions and practices of the church rather than the dogmas of the schools, that the old and precious article of gratuitous salvation had to be wrought out. But they saw this not, or saw it dimly. Unawares to themselves, their protestation at Speier was a death warrant, not only against the Papacy, but against every form of church such as they had the slightest idea of establishing. What possibility could there be of a state or a national church, an institute embracing the people of a country (to speak no longer of the world), and exercising control by any central authority over the faith, morality, discipline and liturgy of elementary congregations, when Christianity itself was a thing of free personal conviction, and nothing allowed to be obligatory but what was enjoined in the word of God.

It could not fail that in all Protestant communities, among the various puritanic tendencies sure to arise, some people should discover that the doctrine of justification by faith alone lies just as truly at the bottom of Scriptural church polity as of evangelical theology, and should demand that institutions and usages arrange themselves accordingly. Baptists did discover it, and it was not long before the magnates of Protestantism perceived that, to avoid an utter explosion of their nascent ecclesiastical systems, such as neither the apparent interest of powerful princes and states, nor, probably, the judgment of the Reformers themselves, would allow, they must rest these systems on new foundations, fortify them with additional assumptions, and guard them with a rigor more cruel than had defended the institution against which they rebelled. They were like the apprentice magician, who, after calling the water-sprite to his aid, was in danger

of being drowned in the blessing ; and having forgotten the disenchanting word, they thought only of violence. Then nothing was left for men of simpler views, but to protest. Baptists every where did protest. They also exhibited "a great deed of conscience." The fires of persecution through which they came forth, unextinguished by rivers of blood, still blaze for our brethren in Protestant Europe, and no where have the embers long ceased to glow.

So completely did the practice of Protestants belie the principle of their being, that it has almost been forgotten *as* their principle, and Roger Williams is often referred to as though the establishment of liberty of conscience had been theoretically as much his prerogative as it was in point of historical fact. No ancient pædobaptist confession which I have happened to meet with states this foundation principle. I have searched the "symbolical books" of the Lutherans in vain for even a clear implication of it. I do not think I should speak too strongly if I said that in such writings it is, in terms or by implication, often contradicted. But every Baptist creed either expressly declares or necessarily implies it as a first truth ; and I hope no general charge of practical inconsistency can be sustained against us.

And now we have come where it is possible to define the past and present position of our denomination in Protestant Christendom. To us it has been given in God's providence to hold fast through much affliction the original principle of Protestantism when it was abandoned, and at some time persecuted, by Christians — papist and protestant alike — of every other name. We have *practically* signalized the supremacy of the Bible, by either rejecting all confessions and articles besides, or disallowing to them any authority, except for those who freely adopt them as consentaneous with the word of God. We have unflinchingly celebrated the sanctity of church membership by refusing it to any except those esteemed regenerate through the Holy Ghost. We have always held to the *autonomy* of each congregation under God, in appointing its officers, observing the ordinances, administering discipline, and doing whatever else a church of Christ

may scripturally do. And when otherwise, the true significance of Baptism might have been lost to the Christian world, we have steadfastly cherished Christ's own form of the rite which symbolizes not only the complete washing of the soul in regeneration, but the death to sin, the resurrection to holiness, the entrance on a new life, and heaven knows how much besides of vital truth. We have shown that these principles are compatible not only with the boundless spread but the unimpaired preservation of all the fundamental tenets of Protestant orthodoxy, and with an actual similarity of organization, doctrine, and usage throughout all our extended borders — a proper catholicity — affording most of the asserted benefits of church unity without its fetters and entanglements. We have seen these first principles of our profession triumphant over the flames, then cautiously approved by the foremost thinkers, statesmen, philanthropists, Christians of other communions, until now they seem almost in sight of recognition by all who truly wish Protestantism success. Outside of the Christian sphere, the Turks have measurably acknowledged the sacred rights of conscience, Siam also, and Madagascar, perhaps Japan, the Fiji Islands ; and quite recently, out of pity, it may be, for the sacrifices of our own brethren, the genius of spiritual emancipation seems hovering over the Protestant churches of Scandinavia, and at last over the land of Luther himself. I am far, indeed, from supposing that we, as individuals of the present generation, have any ground of boasting over Christian brethren of other names. I admit that we have much to learn from them; but I think it due to the facts of our history to suggest whether, but for the leaven of Baptist sentiment and the light of Baptist example through these recent centuries, church and state would not still have remained fast married, and their brood of worldliness, hypocrisy, immorality, and persecution swarming thick in all Christian lands.

Are we not then Protestants, and fairly entitled to share in the glory of all that progress in the church, in the state, and in society, of which Protestantism is the symbol and the source? Why should our polity be classed among the "dis-

eases" of Protestantism? Only to Protestantism in a chill might the spirit in us seem to show a feverish forwardness. To those desiring to be somewhat less than Protestants, we may naturally appear somewhat more. For we are Protestants *of* the Protestants, — Protestants of the second or third power. *That* is our offence. "By protest on protestation," say some who too nearly confound Christianity with ecclesiasticism, "you destroy the unity of the church and rend the body of Christ." But those who thus complain, allow the legitimacy of at least two branches of Protestantism, vaguely denominated the Lutheran and the Reformed; and do not *they* divide the body? But what is of far more consequence is, that the same principle on which they justify their own existence, or that of either of them, justifies ours. Protestantism is a full warrant for conscientious adherence to Scriptural convictions, or it is nothing. And if difference of rites, ceremonies, or governments were damnable under such conditions (which the Augsburg Confession and the Apology rightly deny), then were the Reformation, or at least Protestantism, altogether condemned. Not only was Protestantism necessarily a division, but it was the perpetual bane of compulsory uniformity. Rothe, one of the profoundest of recent European theologians, ably maintains that the Reformation terminated forever the manifestation of Christianity to the world in the form of a church.* And I have no doubt that in the old, juristic sense of the word "Church," he is right. A church there could be never again after Rome was thrown down, but churches only, and *the* church without earthly organization, in whose glory apostles delighted, and a kingdom of God, not of this world. Nor does this doctrine rend the body of Christ. Every congregation is still supposed to possess the spirit of Christ, and to strive within itself after the realization of all that excellence which the apostles ascribe to the ideal church, enjoying meanwhile with others the fellowship of Christian labor and hope and comfort, each stimulat-

* For an interesting account of the man and of his ecclesiastical theory, see Schaf's Germany, &c., as before quoted.

ing the rest by its own fidelity, and ready to embrace the improvements exhibited by them. A better union, certainly, than any formal or constrained identity which could be imposed upon them! Nor is this "sectarian," because there is no normative corporation recognized of divine authority from which others can have parted. It is not necessarily "unhistorical," because every church may and must, reasonably, avail itself of all the lessons of history in applying the simple principles of the New Testament to its own edification and efficiency. If Baptist churches, more than any others, fail in either of these particulars, it is not from any scantiness in their principles, but from the imperfection of their members in knowledge or in grace. That our course is "unchurchly" must, I fear, be admitted, *in the sense* in which all Protestantism is so to Papists and Puseyites. The Protestant era, too, is becoming ever more and more so, as witness the widening fissures in the church of England, the rupture of the Scotch Kirk, the division of the Presbyterian, Episcopal, Methodist, and I know not how many other religious corporations in this country; to say nothing of the fierce struggle of rival confessions in Europe; the Papacy itself meanwhile tottering to its final ruin, and all betokening further divisions and sub-divisions until it be practically established that only Christian men should profess Christian fellowship, and that such *may* join themselves to each other in the Lord, as their mutual edification may require. When this common right is fully recognized, there will be no room for harmful divisions among those who hold the Head. The only emulation of churches will be in zeal to serve the one Master, and to promote the universal triumph of his truth. Then, if the Bible be the word of God, and sufficient for the uses of Christian men, the highest possible unity will be attained when such men, governed simply by that word, conform their usages and institutions to it alone. Then the Christian may be supposed to travel from the equator to the poles, finding himself at home wherever he finds Christians, and that which Schenkel puts as the Protestant church problem will be happily solved under the blessed bishopric of the invisible Head, namely "to incorpo-

rate the particular church into the one true church, and so to identify the church of the believing with the church of the baptized.”*

May I be allowed a word in conclusion, touching the *responsibilities* which our vanward position carries with it? Are we prepared for them? Can we as easily justify our present standing to ourselves as our past course to other professors of the same principles? Shall our future progress be worthy of our past precedence? Protestantism being a principle, is also a problem. Asserting absolute devotion to God's truth, it must inquire how that truth, in all its compass, is to be made effectual for the regeneration of the world. It thus involves a pledge of endless progress in the development of the evangelical theory, and in its living exemplification throughout the social and civil as well as the ecclesiastical relations of mankind. It is movement against stagnation, life against death; life which to continue must advance, which, if it does not grow, dwindles, stiffens, becomes petrified; and, as we may see in several ancient forms of Protestantism, a fossil. While we were decidedly before all others in the recognition of certain great truths of Christianity, and were *heartly* in their advocacy, so that they glowed in the hearts of our fathers like live coals, then their light went abroad and brightened the ends of the earth. But if the time has come, if the time ever does come, when either through the staleness and insipidity of those truths to us, or, because of their practical and substantial adoption by others, we cease to *stand out* as their challengers and champions—not having acquired, meanwhile, some other truths of like importance; if our peculiarities become to us or to our children, forms; our organizations, crystallizations of old truths and usages, however good; if free doctrinal inquiry be fettered or stagnate; if our baptism be retained by us because it is familiar and impressive, not because it is God's; if our ministry become a clergy, and our assemblies other than the scene of genuine Christian fellowship; then Protestantism will find other representatives, other defenders, and in the distant ages of her progress we shall be

* In his article on *die Kirche* in Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie.

left mummies of buried life among the Mennonites of other days, the old German Baptists, and other relics of defunct Protestantism.

It would be impossible to parry the force of such prognostics, if earnestly held out, by assuming that because we are right *so far*, therefore let Christianity make what progress she will, all must come around to our position at last. This would be to repeat the mistake of the lad who, when he looked upward from his father's door-stone, used profoundly to wonder that *he* had been born so exactly under the centre of that great overroofing sky. Doubtless we may rejoice in a relative correctness of present standing among the churches, if we ought not rather to say of tendency or direction. But who would wish to think this absolutely correct, beyond improvement, complete? When we remember how much that is defective or perverse we all find among ourselves—for here the heart knoweth its own bitterness—would it not be sad to believe that any of our churches, as such, had already attained, either were already perfect? Sad, indeed, if there were to be no clearer elucidation of religious mysteries than what we enjoy, no more worthy celebration of divine ordinances no more edifying fellowship and discipline, no more fruitful labors, through the far-stretching centuries of the kingdom *in sæcula sæculorum*! Enough, if we might stand prepared to contribute *our share* to the solution of those great life-problems which the age proposes to the churches! Enough, if, while holding fast whereto we have attained, guarding vigilantly our hereditary *peculium* of doctrine, we go forward in honorable rivalry with other Christians to gather harvests of yet undeveloped truth, and to distribute this bread of life among the famishing children of men! Enough? almost more than enough, if we might still further pioneer the way of the churches to that destined attainment where, with liberty of conscience which may ever occasion varieties of organization and “differences of administration,” there shall still (through the substantial agreement of all believers in faith and practice) be, and *be seen* to be, “one Lord, one faith, one baptism,” one flock within the same fold, under the One Shepherd.

ART. II.—LITERATURE IN DEBT TO LIFE.*

[BY REV. S. L. CALDWELL, D. D., PROVIDENCE, R. I.]

THE occasion which draws together the sons of a college to celebrate the privileges of their calling as scholars, seems to allow no choice for him who is set forward to be its voice, but to speak of some of the interests of literature. But its relations to life are so immediate, that he may be allowed to take the course which is nearest, and examining the account between the two, calculate the debt of literature to life.

Many of us know more of life than of letters. It is by some special grace that we are admitted, once in the year, into the goodly fellowship of scholars. The day serves chiefly to remind us of studies which have long ago come to an end. Life has carried us captive. Master of our thoughts and toils, it has left little room for the liberal culture which was our early aspiration. We have served other gods than those classic ones to which we made our young vows. Into the most practical and unclassic pursuits we may have carried some of the influences of liberal studies once begun. Life has taken some charm and ripeness, if not its law, from the tastes and culture of our academic days. But it is to be confessed for all of us, that action has pushed hard upon thought, that life absorbs culture, and denies to learning what less exacting or less tempting employments would allow. Most of us have taken shelter under the necessity of the case, and the authority of Lord Bacon.† “That,” says he, “will indeed dignify and exalt knowledge, if contemplation and action may be

* This Article is presented in its original form of an Address before the Literary Societies in the University at Rochester, July 8, 1862.

† Advancement of Learning, Book I.

more nearly and strongly conjoined and united together than they have been — a conjunction like unto that of the highest planets, Saturn, the planet of rest and contemplation, and Jupiter, the planet of civil society and action.”

It is the fortune of educated men in America — it seems our hardship, as we revive here the recollection of years given wholly to study,—to be obliged, even on account of their education, to mix actively with life, to bear responsible part in its burdens and severest duties. They lead a strenuous intellectual life, but it is professional, not literary or scholastic. They spend enough mental power to produce a literature, in the practical uses of daily life. The intellectual energies which have built American civilization are certainly not feeble, or unproductive. The national mind may not have reached that late, ripe stage which blooms most naturally into a rich and beautiful literature. Providence has called it to other tasks, and crowned it with fruits as substantial, if not as brilliant. It has compelled us to adjourn literature till we should build a house over our heads. We have had a continent to possess, states to build, a national order to settle, a bright, free, multiplying people to educate and evangelize. Thought, knowledge, genius have gone into works of use, and civility — cities, roads, ships, the state, the school, the church. The waters which might have been concentrated to supply a few aspiring and brilliant fountains, have been kept at a lower level, and carried in more humble and more useful courses from house to house. The rich juices which might have flowered in the centurial aloe, have run to annual grass and corn for a nation's bread. Indeed our experiment would have come to a miserable end long ago, if the genius of the country had run only to Literature and Art. This immense, eager, dense life, charged with tempests, hot with secret, inexhaustible energies, fighting with the wilderness and pushing it ever westward, bursting up into sudden cities, and states which are empires at their birth, tasked under the necessities of a new order, and stimulated by the passions and opportunities of democratic freedom, has drawn out all the funds in our intellectual exchequer. It has taxed heavily, perhaps extremely, the alert brain of the nation, which we will not

allow to be small or dull, which, had it been suppressed into the small civil and economic opportunities of Germany, might have been as fruitful in purely intellectual production. A necessity profound as the Divine purpose which is unfolding in our history, has compelled literature to wait; has set us upon utilizing science instead of exploring its theory; has disturbed the calmness which seems to be indispensable for the deeper processes and combinations of the intellect, that it might be free for the service of the new ideas and needs of American society. In this necessity, which seems so odious to the scholar, and so adverse to literary productiveness, there is a wisdom which is of the Being who brought us hither, who cares more for Man than for books, and who had for the race here a kinder intention than could be answered by any merely æsthetic culture.

In the first place, it is a necessity which, in forcing the mind of the people into practical life, has been aided and also compensated by the immense intellectual property to which we are heirs. While the highest thought of the nation has been depositing itself in institutions, inventions, industries, which elevate life, and give impulse and hope to the race, its intellectual life has been fed from supplies stored in other times and lands, and above all in the language through which five centuries of English mind pours itself for the undivided benefit of both sides of the sea. It is worth a thousand years of history to us that we could start with a literature ready and accumulating, which released the genius of this new world for other service. It is ours by every title; and the ages have furnished no better. Into it have been expressed the choice juices of the modern world,—the softness of the Norman, the pluck of the Saxon, the blood of the best races, the forces of a Divine religion. It traverses the whole width of human life, almost of the human mind; rooted in the real, and yet touching the ideal and the infinite on every side; mounting into the highest heaven of invention; tender and gracious with pathos and an infinite humor, pure and sanative with moral wisdom and spiritual faith; so sincere, so catholic, so human, so alive all through, so opulent in matter,

so various in style ; using, too, and enriching that flexible and vigorous tongue spoken by more people than any civilized speech, pliant to all uses, as stiff as steel and as elastic, limber to love, sonorous as a bugle to liberty and to truth ; the gothic grandeur of cathedrals, the pomp and splendor of emperors' coronations in its stately prose. Leaving out the later affluents which feed the main stream of our American intellect — the influences, and the contributions of German philosophy and criticism in our scholarship — this single fact has been vital in our history. It has relieved and released the highest mind of the country for other toils. It arrested in the beginning, and throughout the transition periods, the tendencies backward and towards barbarism which belong to life in a new country, and in its first rude, exhausting conflicts with the wilderness. It may have seemed our misfortune — an enfeebling and servile dependence. It was really our salvation, one of the most quickening causes of our growth. It is a spurious Americanism which is willing to alienate what is so truly ours, and refuse our part in it because it was not born in our woods. Shakspeare was of the race and class which colonized the shores of Massachusetts, and had he been ten years younger might have come himself. Milton, the puritan and republican, would give America a free title to his works for the sake of what she has done for his principles. It is all ours, and I doubt if we should have done better in refusing it, and setting up a literature for ourselves. That we might have had, and shall have in due time. There has been power enough for it, original, creative, plastic, but it has been cast into other than literary forms. It found that field occupied, and another ready, urgent, rewarding. Says De Tocqueville,* the most philosophic critic of American life, "If the Americans, retaining the same laws and social condition, had had a different origin, and had been transported into another country, I do not question that they would have had a literature. Even as they now are, I am convinced that they will ultimately have one." With all this wealth on hand,

* Democracy in America, Vol. II., lib. i., chap. 13.

thus secure against intellectual impoverishment, and with all the vast demands of practical life on hand too, it has been the most natural result, that without weakening, with a splendid quickening of all intelligence, there should have been an excess of Life over Literature. The quick, forgetive intellect of the country has applied itself to that which was nearest, and produced that which was most necessary and useful, which was really better. It borrowed poets, and made our history a poem. It imported literature, while it was translating the highest political philosophy into facts, the most advanced spiritual ideas into a State. Its works are not printed in books, and gathered in libraries. They are written in the ledgers of commerce and the copy-books of schools taught at public expense. They are printed in the constitutions of free States, and published in the biography of a nation which in three generations has done the work of ages. The power which might have invented *The Tempest* or the *Inferno*, has been finding out the short roads to commodious life and universal knowledge and regulated liberty, subduing Nature to human use with an art better than Prospero's, and rescuing unborn millions from the doom of the country of Dante.

All this the student, jealous for his order, and for the more spiritual interests of society, will lament with not unnatural, perhaps not altogether unreasonable regrets. It may seem a great loss, that we were made for higher work ; that it is a perversion of intellectual power to low uses, submission to a hard, if not base necessity. But literature at the expense of life ; an excellent poet or two with no Declaration of Independence ; great ideas in books, and no idea of liberty or justice wrought into life, and power, and a commonwealth ; fine arts and a wretched people ; a Vatican adorned by genius, and cursed with a Pope ; a nation with more mouths than bread, servile and shiftless and decaying, squeezed into some narrow corner of the world, with elegant writers to tell the story, and sing the poetry of its life,—this is not quite the destiny we started for, or for which the scholar need vent his unavailing sighs. With all the literature of the world at our back ; with all the scholarship we have been able to make

use of ; with every faculty of human nature roused and rushing to meet the great demand, and the unusual opportunity ; with more mind let loose and set to school than in any nation on earth ; with a short yet full history behind, and a long hope before, in which inventive brains, increasing by millions every decade, not content to repeat the past, will search new realms of thought, as they find those of life occupied ; it is hardly necessary yet to be mortified at the failure of Iliads. Sometime it will appear that the triumphs of liberty, and the demands of life are not the defeat and the cessation of letters, but their inspiration ; that Literature and Life have secret understandings and communications : if I may dare say it in the face of a literary society, that Literature is really the servant and debtor of Life.

They are products of the same power, as indeed Literature is a product and exponent of life itself. It is a notion not uncommon, and yet rather pedantic, that all intellect, certainly all genius, is absorbed in the forms of Literature and art, that a book is the only intellectual work. But hard study is not confined to colleges, nor is a library the only repository of thought. Bayonets think, and we put into guns what we once put into types, which they have been too slow or too soft to utter. It is an armed Idea which lines our disputed borders with a forest of steel. Ideas express themselves not more in the forms of language, than in institutions, manners, mechanisms, in emigrations, revolutions, industries and worships. There is an immense expenditure of mental force in all the details of that great sum which we call civilization. The ampler, the more intense is social life, so much the sharper the provocation to all intellectual exertion. Taste, invention, knowledge, indeed whatever mental qualities enter into many forms of literature, are called into action and find expression in commodious and cultivated life. The vital and moving forces which stir and direct the life of our time, will at last lodge themselves in literature ; but how many of these have their birth and action outside of it ! The spiritual and intellectual energies which rush into action, which beat in the pulses of society, which put on the robe of life, and go forth

to answer the calls of civilization, are from the same source, and serve a want as true, perhaps as sacred, as learning or poetry. In literature the mind employs language, in life other instruments. In the one it is a coarse kind of power, not thorough and delicate, which does not at once command the respect of the scholar, who regards the finer workings and issues of the mind ; but the difference is in the instrument more than in the force which uses it. The instrument may not be as fine, or the record as permanent, but the total power of an educated manhood may go into one as well as the other, and a people's civilization may express as high a life as their literature. Indeed language, as the instrument of literature, is a creature of life, as much as of thought, and decays unless recruited from other than literary sources. The impulse and breath of life, of popular life, must go into it, to keep it fresh and clear, running like a living stream. Says Max Müller,* "Literary dialects, or what are commonly called classical languages, pay for their temporary greatness by inevitable decay." To adopt his figure, the literary language freezes like a river, smooth, brilliant, stiff, till in some social convulsion the popular element rises, life breaks loose, the crystal surface cracks, and popular language revitalizes the old dialect, and like a spring flood sweeps the old formation away. As soon as a language ceases to supply the living wants of a people, and becomes unpliant to daily uses, and remote from the common life of men, it enters on an artificial existence, and soon is dead. Literature is indebted to Life for the instrument which it uses, and by which it is preserved. Indeed, language, divine gift, marvellous organ of thought that it is, is only one among the manifold implements which the spirit of man uses to express, or to accomplish its purpose. In a not unintelligible sense, civilization, in its laws, usages, acquisitions, appliances, is a language, the broadest, richest, last word of the human mind. It is human thought, the poetry, philosophy, invention, knowledge, the genius and faith of a people, or an epoch, translated and incorporated

* Lectures on the Science of Language, English edition, Sect. II., p. 59.

into form. So much of it as is in words is literature ; which is but a part. It may be the best part, and the highest form. In any civilization which is worth anything, its office and fruit is most needful and precious. It serves to fix the fluid forces of thought, to embody the fine, invisible life of souls, "to preserve as in a phial the purest efficacy and extraction" of the best minds. It is, as Milton says, "the seasoned life of man, preserved and stored up in books." It keeps the continuity of the world's thinking, and accumulates capital for the new generations. It is the mirror on which is reflected the ancient, and the distant ; in which an age is able to see itself ; in which man is revealed to man. It is the ministry of mind to mind, education, nourishment, comfort to the soul ; in spite of Mr. Buckle, one of the constant and prime motors in society. This hour is our tribute to it. This University is a public acknowledgement of it, as one of the higher interests of life. It is not to be disparaged.

Neither is Life. For both are of man, and often, the one as well as the other, of what is deepest, cunningest, best in him. Indeed life contains and reveals what does not go into writing, what is itself only a sublimer literature. What history as great as the life it describes ? What unwritten histories, poetries, in the life of persons and nations ! There is a poetry in life before it is in words. If it is the office of the poet to idealize life, so there are lives in which poetry is realized. The true may surpass the invented. Is a beautiful, heroic character less admirable than a work of art ? Is there no comparison between Joan of Arc and a drama of Racine ? and need the verdict go in favor of the invented against the real ? Is life reproduced in a book, even by the hand of genius, greater and more beautiful than it is in fact ? This, indeed, is the high office of poetry, to extract and condense the finer spirit of beauty in the common and homely world about us,

"Clothing the palpable and the familiar
With golden exhalations of the dawn."

But, as a sunset of Claude or Turner is no finer than every one of us has seen inflaming the west, as Nature precedes

Art, so genius only discovers with finer insight the beauty and the sacredness already in life, and invests it with ideal colors. The glory and the mystery are there in life, and how grand and marvellous it is ! the life of a single soul, its appetites, its aspirations, the stamps of heaven, of hell, upon it ; its joys and glooms, the possibilities, the eternities that are in it ; the complex, multitudinous life, beating everywhere, its contending and coöperative energies, the wild, the wrathful, the beautiful, tamed to the touch of the Cross, royal with a glory from above the stars, breathing "airs from heaven, blasts from hell ;" its intercourses, its achievements, its miseries ; "in huts where poor men lie," moving through streets, flying across seas, bursting into wildernesses, building, wasting, sinking lost into graves ; life, civic, historic, of states and races, its fierce strifes, dark wrongs, hungry wants, sour and mad how much of it, unspeakably great, and touching, even in its wretchedness and guilt—this marvellous life of man, what study so instructive, what literature can express it, or equal it ? Says Menzel, in his history of German Literature,* "Literature mirrors life, not only more comprehensively, but more clearly than any other monument, because no other representation furnishes the compass and depth of speech. Yet speech has its limits, and life only has none. The abyss of life no book has yet closed up. It is only single chords that are struck in you when you read a book ; the infinite harmony which slumbers in your life, as in the life of all, no book has yet entirely caught."

And it is to Life Literature is indebted for its material and inspiration. It is the expression, and as it were spiritual exhalation of the living world. The best literature, that which is alive, has life *in* it, is drawn from the life of the writer, of mankind, transmits the life of man to man, is vital with his soul. It is not only about life, but is imbued with it. It is about life. For while writing and study are engaged upon much which has no special bearing upon human life, the "literature of power" which Mr. De Quincey so finely distin-

* Felton's Translation, I., 15.

guishes from that of knowledge, in his *Essay on Pope*,* is concerned with men, and their living interests, passions, doings, and wants. Whether it be poetry, philosophy, or history, — and these divide and embrace literature — it is the human in them, their connection with man's real life, which clothes them with interest. If they throw light on human being and destiny, if they come home to men's business and bosoms, if they touch human life, revealing its secrets, describing its manners, unfolding its relations, above all helping toward its ends, this is their worth and benefit. The writing which probably at this present hour covers most paper, reaches most eyes, and is devoured with most satisfaction, is first the novel, joining with it poetry, biography and history, all constituting what may be called by distinction the Literature of Life, because that is its staple and subject, as it is its inspiration. There is a literature which is entirely bloodless and impersonal, and very much of it comes of no life, and reaches none. "Sir," said Hazlitt, "I am a metaphysician, and nothing makes an impression upon me but abstract ideas." There are books as naked as the intellect which bore them. They need to be dressed, put into flesh, like Sidney Smith's poor satirized friend, whose intellects were improperly exposed, in order to come into the living world, and into contact with men. The book which is charged with the life of its author, and the life of his time, carries in it weight and force which make it last, and give it influence. The heart of man draws to that which has heart in it, and the flavor of a kindred soil. The author's genius will take color and turn from his life. Unless it is fed from that, even from a life as rich as his genius, it usually becomes thin and barren. There is a hardy realism in the great poets, which is acquired from life, which shows that they were fed on beef as well as ambrosia. They are as true to life as they are to their genius. Their poetry flows from their age, as well as from themselves. Their writings are the best history, for they are the reflection of their times. Through the ideal atmosphere which robes the *Iliad*, the men, the women, the

* *Essays on the Poets*, 149, 155.

life, the time, the gods even, look clear and real. There is a veracity which vindicates its birth in that age, as well as in Homer's brain, declaring that he saw it all in life before he

"Beheld the Iliad and the Odyssey
Rise to the swelling of the voiceful sea."

Indeed, this is the charm, the vital and durable charm, of the classics, which gives them their hold upon the modern world. Says Dr. Temple, the Master of Rugby,* "The classics possess a charm quite independent of genius. It is not their genius only which makes them attractive; it is the classic life — the life of the people of that day; it is the image there only to be seen of our highest natural powers in their freshest vigor; it is the unattainable grace of the prime of manhood; it is the pervading sense of youthful beauty. Hence, while we have elsewhere great poems and great histories, we never find again that universal radiance of fresh life which makes even the most common-place relics of classic days models for our highest art."

This is the use of literature, that it catches and holds what otherwise were so fugitive; the life which else would dry up and be lost. It stops and photographs "the manners living as they rise." Into it the time expresses itself, its form and its essence. The Canterbury Tales of Chaucer run over with the vivid life of the fourteenth century in England. All early poetry especially, born in the morning, before genius grows reflective, and is "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought," is objective and picturesque, reflecting not the poet's soul, but the world in which he lives. Rarely, perhaps never, is individual genius able to escape the influence, to withstand the spirit of its age — that larger genius which embraces and breathes through all. The life of an epoch is mightier than any soul in it, and stamps itself into the thought and the words of those even who come into it puissant to rule it, or dreadful to purify. The verse which seems spontaneous as the blowing of winds, or the song of birds, is modified inevit-

* Essays and Reviews, English Edition, page 27.

ably by the nature and society, the place and the period in which it was born. It impregnates literature with its own qualities, and supplies the conditions of health and disease, of intellectual barrenness or fertility. The periods of literary fruitfulness may not always synchronize with those of aroused and strenuous action, or of storm and strife. It would seem as if the era of great and crowded life must necessarily quicken genius, and produce a rich spiritual harvest. But it may be too tempestuous, while the mind waits for calmness and the Indian summer to ripen. The pressure may be too severe or unequal; it may raise the general level, instead of single peaks. It may exhaust, rather than nourish. It may disturb the crust to make vineyards for another generation. The violent passions may burn, instead of suffusing literature with their warm vigor. All intellectual action may be forced away from poetry. The genius which would flower rich and rare, compressed into the life and dialect of Athens, may be depressed or dissipated in the great field of a nation spread over a vast space, and perhaps still more as its numbers swell to a similar vastness. In a great national controversy, when ideas and tendencies long held in the air, precipitate in a bloody shower, then emancipated tendencies may also break forth into a literature of power and beauty, intellectual and civil deliverance alike coming in the sharpness of swords.

What prospects for literature open out of the great struggle through which we are expecting to pass into a new and higher order of national life; whether it is to stimulate or depress our intellectual life; whether it is to touch our spirits to finer issues, and bloom with fresh genius as well as new-born justice; as indeed, what in all ways is coming, are questions which front us without any sure answer.

None have more at stake in them, and in the event, than the educated men, to whom ideas, culture, knowledge, good letters, are so precious before all things. The scholar owes his country a filial love. His enlarged and catholic fellowship with the poets, philosophers and orators of all lands and times, his loyalty to "the dead but scepted sovereigns, who still rule our spirits from their urns," the generous

spirit of learning has never elsewhere, and has not here, repressed his noble rage for his country. Have we not felt upon us the breath of that new life which leaped out of the popular heart fifteen months ago? Did we not read that new revelation, that resurrection of latent nobleness, with the spirit, perhaps the language of Wordsworth?

When I have borne in memory what has tamed
Great nations, how ennobling thoughts depart
When men change swords for ledgers, and desert
The student's bower for gold; some fears unnamed
I had, my country. Am I to be blamed?
But when I think of thee and what thou art,
Verily in the bottom of my heart,
Of those unfilial fears I am ashamed.
But dearly must we prize thee; we who find
In thee a bulwark for the cause of men.*

A war in whose issue lies clear "the cause of men" as in ours; which penetrates and leavens the whole life of the nation; which fills the great country with a soul as great; whose cannon thunder a great idea, which must unify and nationalize our people; which makes such strain upon all the emotions, and excites such enthusiasms; which is disciplining us in a new school and to nobler virtues, with its immediate results, must have its remoter influences in our intellectual life. It must enlarge the area of education. It cannot arrest scholarship. It must affect literature through the life it leaves, and the atmosphere it has cleared. Our stronger convictions, and our spiritual hurts, what we gain, and what we suffer, will make themselves felt through the brain, and in the coming harvests of thought and art. Some new inspirations must start, and flow, and find a way into the color, if not the grain of our literature. Hidden genius may be uncovered; repressed tendencies may be let loose by the sword. Individual genius, born in this more tense and defecated climate of a new national life, will be touched by forces in happy combination with which it may produce in quantity and quality worthy of an age so advanced.

* Sonnets dedicated to Liberty, XVII.

Vol. xxvii.*—36.

As literature flows out from life, so it returns thither, and is related to it as means to an end. It is the minister, as well as the interpreter of life. It is one among many agencies tributary to the one end, intellectual culture — indeed, to the whole life. This is the terminus of all literature which answers any tolerable purpose. The aim, the tendency rather, may be unconscious. Spontaneousness belongs to genius, to all the best forms of art. There may be intention where it does not reveal itself as conscious. *Ars est celare artem.* In every work of high art there is this latent intention, which is its informing idea, the norm of its growth, which blooms from it, as sweetness comes out of the new hay. Genius conceals its object, and yet accomplishes it. Mere mechanic talent appends a moral, instead of drawing it out of the reader's own mind by its own suggestive strokes. And yet genius, literature, must submit to the universal law of God's realm, to be useful, or it is dismissed, and has no place. It may flow at its own sweet will, and know only its own impulse and pleasure in the work; but to this test it must come at last. And all literature that lives, and is cherished in human love, has this quality. It serves the uses, the finer and more spiritual uses of life. It is of power to breed better thoughts, to take us out of ourselves a little, to help us forget, to help us remember, "to inform man in the best reason of living," to charm and "support his uneasy steps over the burning marle." It is of use in ways which cannot be weighed in the market. It has, indeed, its mercantile and economic value. Shakspeare harnessed the ethereal coursers of the sun to thrifty uses, and made them earn his living. *Paradise Lost* brought five pounds, which perhaps is as much as it is worth, if it were not above all price. For the life is more than meat, and it is more than literature. For if any book does not beget more life, if it does not "build up the being that we are," if it neither chastens, nor excites, nor expands, nor nourishes, if it fills no want, if it has no connection with the inward, or the everlasting life, the cook and the trunk-maker have uses for waste paper, let it find its mission! To live, not as the oyster, to live out what is in us, truly, humbly, fully,

may, to live what is not in us, but in Another, whose word is not so much a literature as a life, is the purpose for which we are in this world at all, and for it we need all helps. Life is greater than literature, as all the rivers run into the sea, and it is never full. Life is better than learning, is the test and the end of it. If it answers no use of life in you, in society, here or hereafter, it has no use at all. It is dead, being alone. The ambition to be simply a learned man, with no reference to life, is no better than the ambition to be simply a fat man. Indeed, they are very much the same. Literature is a thing by the way, the chariot and not the goal. At the end is life, true, large, beautiful, eternal.

A clear and vigorous, but rather wrong-headed writer, Mr. Buckle, has lately undertaken to rule out literature from any influence in the progress of mankind, in favor of rice and dates; to persuade us that food has more to do with the civilization of nations than æsthetic or spiritual causes. It must be confessed that this cancels rather summarily the account between literature and life, and places the debt entirely on the contrary side. It assumes that the intellectual life of nations and the race is subject to a singular law of inconsistency; that it does not run in a stream, the past pressing upon the present, and augmenting, if not directing the current; that literature does not create an intellectual climate and soil as positive in power over men as any physical circumstance. Modern education is rooted somewhere, and where, if not in the past thought, in the dead and living literatures of the world? The universities hold fast their anchorage here. The poets and philosophers and historians will be likely to hold men as they have done. ' And literature will still and always serve the uses of social, as well as of personal culture and life, and leave its mark on both. It is a nourisher of the State. It helps the citizen to love his country, illustrated by arts as well as arms. It hallows the very ground, the plain house where Shakspeare was born, the Santa Croce where Italy's best dust is buried. It answers base uses and the best, according to the spirit in which it is written, and in which it is read. It may overmaster and enslave the mind, ruling life

with that which is only its image, choking the fountain out of which it came; sometimes the flowing thought hardened into a word not of life but of death, which has petrified centuries. "But at the same time," to quote Menzel again,* "literature has furnished an acceptable instrument for every struggle of the age. In her golden book every one has registered his vote. She is a shield to righteousness and virtue, a temple to wisdom, a paradise to innocence, a cup of delight to love, a Jacob's ladder to the poet, but also a fierce weapon to party spirit, a plaything for trifling, a stimulant to wantonness, an easy-chair to laziness, a spring-wheel to gossip, a fashion to vanity, a merchandise to the spirit of gain, and has served like a handmaid, all the great and little, pernicious and useful noble and mean, interests of the time."

And now it is life again, which is to save literature from its dangers and mischiefs; which is corrective and medicinal; which must be mixed with it to give it health and sanity. There is a great deal of literature which is morbid, not to say vicious. And its diseases come generally of too little life, of being put to nurse away from the real world and its contacts. Its blood is thin and sublimated. It wants an infusion of sense and mother-wit, to touch the ground, however high it flies toward the moon. For many poets' souls are "like stars and dwell apart." Their poetry lacks body, and richness, and health, for it is spun out of their own fancy. It does not come out of life—a generous, out-of-door, wholesome life. Their genius is sick for want of air and exposure. Their verse is too fine-spun and remote from reality. The trouble is, it is not married to life. There is an ideal to which the poet must go for his law, and not to life and his times. He must come into his time as a teacher and minister of beauty, who has looked upon the invisible. He must bring down to life what he does not find in it. But, nevertheless, he must keep his hold of the earth, that he may have something to correct, to steady, to orient himself by. The æronaut in his farthest flight feels the attractions of the earth, and is carried in the currents of the

* German Literature, I: 17.

atmosphere, and must depend upon them to bring him back, after his sublime visions, to the earth again. Scholarship needs practical sense and knowledge of the world to balance itself. Seclusion and study, unless tempered by some part in affairs, some knowledge of the world, will make men very bookish, very learned and very stupid. The simple-minded Goldsmith, "who wrote like an angel, and talked like poor Poll," proposed to travel broad, and bring home improvements. "He will bring home a wheelbarrow, and call that an improvement," said Dr. Johnson. Menzel satirizes the German scholars and writers who live like Troglodytes in their book-holes, refining and dreaming. "Whether the slater has fallen from the roof, or Napoleon from his throne, they say, ah, ah, indeed, indeed, and thrust their roses again into their books." This is one of the evils in German scholastic life. Mind has been compelled to retreat from life into books, till it knows no world but the dead or dreamy one it finds there. This is not our peril. But it is one reason why studious men should not be too jealous of life and its exactions.

And as life is corrective and curative of the dangers and vices of literature, so is it preservative, and really gives it immortality. There is some vitality in the literature which survives the doom of decay and dust, which belongs alike to man and his books. Lost literature enough there is, more than can be measured, sunk into Lethe and all-devouring time. It had not tenacity of existence and of hold upon man's love and memory, and so it perished. This mortality of books, of the making of which, long ages before the invention of printing, there was said to be no end, is one of the suggestive facts in history, of which much might be said. It is only for us to account for it. They dropped out of the memory, because they dropped out of the life of man. They perished because their use was transient, and the life that was in them small and brief. They died because they were not fit to live, or able. Search after the secret of this longevity of the Hebrew Scriptures, of the best classics, of all yet living literature which men read and so keep alive. It is the universal human element, which is true to man everywhere and always.

In one word it is life in them, human life, which never wearies, which always delights; that touch of nature which makes the world kin, and all the ages one; it is not so much what is national and local; it is the life of a great soul, which has drunk into the life of humanity, not its superficial appearances, but its central spirit, and made its words vehicles of that life. It is the key which Ben Jonson gave to Shakespeare's immortality:

* "And for his poesy, 'tis so rammed with life,
That it shall gather strength with being,
And live hereafter more admired than now."

It is the key which Jesus gives to the immortal freshness of the gospels: "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

Do I seem now, gentlemen, to have been disloyal to letters, to offend against the majesty of the mistress of your vows and the presiding genius of the place and hour, in thus daring to assert the claim of life? Whether it be the silver, or the golden side of the shield, I am not unmindful that it has a reverse; that scholarship is your privilege and duty; that the claims of learning and literature upon society are not too much declared. Perhaps not here, in this learned court, but elsewhere, and at the bar of popular opinion, I am ready to plead their cause. But it is in their interest and for their sake; it is because literature is so closely related to life that I have ventured to use the hour which your hospitality allows the son of another college, in asking you to look kindly, and not jealously, on this seeming rival of the interests you here cultivate. Few can follow literature or scholarship, as the work and pleasure of their days, but all can live, and must, can live heroic poems, which Milton declared is the best preparation for writing them. You can make literature the instrument of culture, and culture the instrument of life, larger and higher. You can live and perpetuate influence, though you add not a line to your land's language.

Both are before you, broad, inspiring, inviting. Have faith

* The Poetaster, Act V. scene 1.

to believe that for each of you there remain unfound secrets, an infinite and open universe. Think not that possibility is concluded; that literature has all been written; that life in its great opportunities and inspirations is exhausted. There is yet truth, there is yet life, great, rich, untried. It is the shell and surface we know. In philosophy is no ultimate analysis. History is not yet written. Arnold and Mömmsen show how even the old can be written new. There are yet poems in nature, in life, in the universe around us, in the soul within us, in the world to which it is an opening and window. And surely there is life in this time and land, in which great duty can be done, in which a scholar can fulfil his best ideal. "This," the word is Schiller's,* "this let him imprint and express in fiction and truth; imprint in the sport of his imagination and the earnest of his actions; imprint it in all sensible and spiritual forms, and cast it silently into everlasting time."

* On the *Æsthetic Education of Man*, translated in Carlyle's *Miscellanies*, I; 63.

ART. III.—THE FREEWILL BAPTISTS ; THEIR HISTORY
AND DOCTRINES.

[BY REV. WM. HURLIN, DAMARISCOTTA MILLS, ME.]

- 1—*The History of the Freewill Baptists for half a century. By* REV. I. D. STEWART. *Vol. I. From the year 1780 to 1830. Dover : Freewill Baptist Printing Establishment. 1862. pp. 479.*
- 2—*Natural and Revealed Theology. A System of Lectures, embracing the Divine Existence and Attributes; Authority of the Scriptures; Scriptural Doctrine; Institutions and Ordinances of the Christian Church. By* JOHN J. BUTLER, DD., *Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological School at New Hampton, N. H. Dover: Freewill Baptist Printing Establishment. 1861. pp. 456.*
- 3—*A Treatise on the Faith of the Freewill Baptists, with an Appendix, containing a Summary of their Usages in Church Government. Written under the directions of their G. Conference. Fourth Edition. Revised. Dover: Published by the Freewill Baptist Printing Establishment. 1848. pp. 114, 62.*
- 4—*The Freewill Baptist Quarterly. Vols. I to X. 1853-62.*
- 5—*The Freewill Baptist Quarterly Magazine. 1839-41.*
- 6—*Minutes of the General Conference of the Freewill Baptist Connection. 1827-1859.*
- 7—*Annual Reports of the Freewill Baptist Benevolent Societies. 1835-1861.*
- 8—*The Freewill Baptist Register. Dover. 1862.*

A HISTORY of this denomination had been in contemplation for a number of years, when, in 1853, a committee was appointed for the collection of materials, which, at the expiration of five years, were placed in the hands of Rev. I. D. Stewart, to prepare the work for publication. In the volume before us,

we have the first installment of the work, embracing the first half century of the denomination. Criticism of the volume is not our present purpose; we aim simply at a brief historical sketch, availing ourselves of its contents, and of such facts as we have been able to glean from other sources. The author has laid his own denomination under great obligations, besides making a valuable contribution towards a general ecclesiastical history of this country. Contenting ourselves with simply expressing the hope that he will be encouraged to complete his undertaking, we proceed with our sketch.

Benjamin Randall was born in Newcastle, N. H., February 7th, 1749, and, like many other useful men, was blessed with a pious mother. In his youth he appears to have been moral and attentive to religious duties, but remained unconverted. In 1770 Rev. George Whitefield preached at Portsmouth, and Randall heard him with feelings of opposition. Two days afterwards, September 30th, he heard that Whitefield had died that morning, and the Holy Spirit appears to have blessed this announcement to him: "Whitefield," said he to himself, "is now in heaven; but I am on the road to hell." He was in much distress and anxiety for about two weeks, when Hebrews ix: 26 was applied to his mind, and he was led to the exercise of faith in Christ as his Saviour. Two years after this, he and his wife joined the Congregational church; but when his third child was born, he was led to the examination of the subject of infant baptism, and did not give up the inquiry till there was a perfect satisfaction in his own mind that immersion, and the immersion of believers only, was the baptism of the Bible.* On naming the matter to some brethren with whom he was accustomed to meet for social worship, he was surprised to learn that they were of the same mind with himself. The result was, that on the day Rev. William Hooper was ordained at Berwick, Maine,† as a Baptist minister he baptized Mr. Randall and three others, who thus became members of the Baptist church at Berwick.

* History of the Freewill Baptists, page 40.

† This was Aug. 14th, 1776, and Mr. H. is supposed to have been the first Baptist minister ordained in Maine. See Millet's History of the Baptists in Maine, page 32.

Mr. Randall had for some time felt it to be his duty to preach, and had resisted the conviction, but at length, being urged by his brethren at Newcastle, he yielded to a sense of duty, and God so blessed his efforts, that in 1777 thirty persons were supposed to be converted. In accordance with the invitation of the people in New Durham, N. H., he, in 1778, concluded to remove to that town, but declined their offer of a financial provision for his support, as he believed it was his duty to itinerate. In 1779, Mr. Randall and others discovered that he did not agree with what are called the Calvinistic views held by Baptists, and from that time, though no formal steps were taken, there was a practical separation. In March, 1780, he united with a Baptist church in Barrington (now Strafford), of which Rev. Tosier Lord was pastor; and in April 5th of the same year, he was ordained as an evangelist, at New Durham, by Revs. Tosier Lord and Edward Lock, and Ruling Elder John Shepherd. Mr. Lord had been ordained a Baptist minister in 1776, but was, at this time, with his church occupying an independent position. Mr. Lock had been a licentiate of the Gilmanton Baptist church, of which John Shepherd was also a member, but a council called to ordain him, not being satisfied with his doctrinal views, he was ordained by Mr. Lord and a lay brother,* probably John Shepherd,† and became pastor of a Baptist church at London and Canterbury, which thenceforth appears to have become independent.

At the time of Mr. Randall's ordination, there was no church in New Durham, but in June of the same year, he and six others *organized themselves*‡ into a church, approving and adopting thirteen articles of faith, and signing a covenant. Others uniting with them, Benjamin Randall was chosen pastor and clerk on the second of September. They called themselves a Baptist church, and for a number of years its ministers and members were certified as "Regular Baptists,"§ but in reality this was the first Freewill Baptist church.

* History of the Freewill Baptists, page 39.

† Ibid., page 50. ‡ Ibid., page 54. § Ibid., pages 55, 76.

Pelatiah Tingley graduated at Yale College in 1761, and afterwards became a Congregational minister. Coming to the conclusion that sprinkling was not baptism, he became one of the first members of the Baptist church in Sanford, Maine, which was organized in 1772. Mr. Stewart says he was ordained pastor of that church in October of the same year,* but Mr. Millet thinks they had no pastor till 1798.† Mr. Tingley seems to have dissolved his connection with the Baptists about the same time with Mr. Randall.

Samuel Weeks was a member of the Baptist church in Gilmanton, N. H.; received a license to preach in 1777, and was ordained pastor of the church in 1780. Sympathizing with Randall in his views of doctrine, he soon after joined the new denomination. Daniel Hibbard is stated to have been a Baptist minister in Maine,‡ and to have identified himself with Randall and Tingley as early as 1782. It appears, then, that Randall, Tingley, Weeks, and Hibbard may be regarded as the first Freewill Baptist ministers. They appear to have had also the assistance of Messrs. Lord, Lock, and Shepherd, but the first of these never formally united with them, and the others did not unite with them till twelve years afterwards.

During the year 1780, Mr. Randall made his first tour in Maine, preaching in various places. The next year he went again, and during an absence from home of thirty-seven days travelled four hundred miles, attended forty-seven public meetings, and organized several churches. In 1783, Randall and the other ministers who agreed with him, submitted to the churches a proposition for holding a general meeting four times a year, and this was agreed to by them.

Mr. John Whitney was the first minister ordained after the new denomination was formed.§ He travelled from Gouldsboro, Maine, 150 miles, to attend the quarterly meeting at New Durham, N. H., in 1785, and was there ordained;

* History, page 51. † History of the Baptists in Maine, page 35. ‡ History of the Freewill Baptists, page 52.

§ Joseph Boody had before this been ordained Ruling Elder, and he, unlike others, is reckoned among the ministers. Hist., page 85.

Messrs. Randall, Tingley, and Hibbard taking part in the exercises.

Revivals often followed the quarterly meetings, and the denomination continued to increase. It is estimated that in 1790 there were twenty churches (three in New Hampshire, and seventeen in Maine), eight ministers, seven unordained preachers, and nine Ruling Elders. The Ruling Elder was the moderator of the church, and in the absence of a Teaching Elder, he administered the ordinances.

The "open communion" question was first mooted in September, 1781, but was waived. It was again introduced in 1784, and the decision was postponed; but in 1785, the New Durham church voted, "We believe it duty, for the future, to give leave to such brethren as are not baptized by immersion, whom we fellowship in the spirit, to commune with us occasionally, if they desire it."*

The "washing of feet," as a religious ordinance to be observed after the Lord's Supper, seems to have been introduced very soon after the formation of the denomination, and Mr. Stewart gives frequent instances of its observance.† There were some,‡ however, who expressed their dissent from this practice "as an innovation among the ordinances of the gospel," but they had to confess their "want of charity towards those who felt it duty to observe the washing of feet." We believe that there is no vestige of this practice remaining in the denomination; but we find it was discussed in the General Conferences as late as 1835.§

John Russell, afterwards a prominent minister among the Freewill Baptists, and still living, aged 96, was converted in 1790. In 1791, "a great majority of the members" of the New Durham church "were backslidden," and they concluded that they were "no longer a church in visible standing," and therefore they *re-organized*. This early example has, we believe, been often followed, and we think with injurious effect.

* Hist., page 101. † Ibid., pages 69, 75, 83, 111. ‡ Ibid., page 102. § Minutes of General Conference, 1830, 1831, 1835:

In 1792, the New Durham church had one hundred and twenty-six members, living in fifteen different towns, and Mr. Randall, seeing that this was inconvenient, summoned a meeting of delegates from the different branches, and it was agreed that delegates should thus meet every three months, and be called the New Durham Quarterly Meeting. This plan was adopted in other places, and thus originated the present Quarterly Meetings. The meeting established in 1783, and which was a general meeting of the whole denomination, was henceforth to be called a Yearly Meeting, although it still held four sessions a year, in four different places. In the same year, Ephraim Stinchfield was baptized. He commenced preaching soon afterwards; but, through timidity, failed several times. Some members of the church in New Gloucester "charged him before the yearly meeting with having 'wounded the cause of God by endeavoring to preach six or seven times, and could not.' "* Ultimately, however, he became a leading and useful minister. In 1799, we have a record of the ordination to the ministry of John M. Bailey, in Maine, by Ruling Elder Timothy Cunningham and Deacon Daniel Dunton, no ordained minister taking part in the service.† At this time "deacons and ruling elders who had been ordained, were encouraged to baptize, and some of them did so in the absence of a minister."‡

For a number of years, while those outside the denomination had given them various names, they had continued to call themselves Baptists. But in 1799 we find them using the designation "Freewill Baptists" in ordination certificates.§

The first Freewill Baptist church in Vermont appears to have been formed at Strafford about 1792. In the autumn of 1802, two ministers went by request into Lower Canada, and their labors being blessed, they baptized converts, and organized churches there. Avery Moulton was ordained at Stanstead, in that province, in 1806. He appears to have been an earnest and useful minister, and is still represented in the ministry of the denomination by his three sons.

* Hist., page 121. † Hist., page 135. ‡ Ibid., page 194. § Ibid., page 175

The denomination sustained a painful loss in October, 1808, in the death of Randall, its founder and early guardian. He had been an earnest, painstaking and diligent minister. Every year for nearly thirty years he had taken long and wearisome journeys, preaching the gospel. One extract from his diary will illustrate this: "Here ends my journal for 1807; having travelled only two thousand five hundred and ninety-three miles, and having been so much unwell, I have attended only two hundred and three public meetings, besides weddings and funerals."* He died at the age of 59. Before his death, he wrote a long letter to the Quarterly Meeting, expressing satisfaction with his doctrinal views, warning them of dangers that they would meet, and especially deprecating the notion that had been introduced among them that the wicked would be annihilated. The only sermon of his that was published, was a funeral sermon preached February 27th, 1803.

The first efforts to obtain full statistics were made in 1805. But in addition to carelessness and indifference, there were found among them at that time, "good men who feared that this enumeration would be like David's numbering Israel, displeasing to God."†

In 1809, John Colby, a young man of 22, began to preach in Vermont. Having been ordained, believing that he was moved thereto by the Holy Spirit, he started on horseback for a journey into the far west of that day. He went through Pennsylvania and Ohio; crossed into Indiana, and returned by way of Lake Erie and Niagara Falls, preaching almost every day, and stopping where circumstances appeared to call for it. On this journey he travelled three thousand miles, and was eight months from home. After this he travelled in other places, and in 1812 organized the first Freewill Baptist church in Rhode Island. He died in Virginia, November 28, 1817, far from home and personal friends. He depended much on impressions, and sometimes gave injudicious expression to them.‡ He also believed in the power to restore the

* Hist., page 246. † Ibid., page 264.

‡ See Life of John Colby, Vol. I., page 113.

sick to health by the prayer of faith.* But he was a good man, abundant in labor, very impressive as a preacher, and we have been told by those who knew him, that "his singing would thrill a whole congregation." Mr. Stewart says of him: "During the six years of his active ministry he baptized six hundred and fifty persons, and the number that became Christians through his instrumentality must have been *very great*."†

Just before Colby set out on his journey to the West, Rev. N. Brown removed from Vermont to New York, and after a short time organized a Freewill Baptist church in Bethany, Genesee county. In 1812, "he ordained Jeremiah Folsom" to "the work of the ministry;"‡ and from this beginning, the denomination spread in the State of New York. Other Freewill Baptist ministers followed Rev. John Colby, and settled in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and churches of that order were formed in those States.

In 1821, died Rev. Pelatiah Tingley, in his 87th year. He had been uniformly consistent and useful during the whole of his career. He is said to have been "a man of few words, but of close observation, and unlike many of that day was noted for his short prayers and sermons. Rev. Daniel Hibbard, another of the first Freewill Baptist ministers, died in 1828. We may here note that Rev. Samuel Weeks, the only survivor of the first four Freewill Baptist ministers, lost his way in the woods in the winter of 1795, while returning home from an evening meeting, and had to spend the night in the cold and wet. He found the path in the morning, but he never recovered from the effects of the exposure. Having suffered physically and mentally for thirty-seven years, he died in 1832, aged 86.

In 1821, the first Freewill Baptist church in Connecticut was formed, but it was not till some time afterwards that it became acquainted with and united with the denomination. The first Freewill Baptist church in Indiana was organized by Rev. Marcus Kilborn in 1820.

* Life, Vol. I., page 114; Vol. II., page 44. † History of the Freewill Baptists, page 317. ‡ Ibid., page 320.

David Marks, of the State of New York, then a lad of fifteen, commenced to preach in 1821, and travelled in various places. He was generally called "the boy-preacher," and met with much difficulty and opposition.* But difficulties were nothing to him, come from what source they might. In 1826, he was ordained to the work of the ministry, in his 21st year; and till his death was an active and leading minister.

The ecclesiastical polity of the Freewill Baptists was the growth of circumstances. At first the monthly meetings formed in various places, were regarded as branches of the New Durham church; and when the quarterly meetings were formed, they seem "to have been regarded as the church;"† for they received members, and claimed the sole right of rejecting them. They also assumed a general control of the churches,‡ and exercised almost despotic power over the ministers.§ In like manner the yearly meetings assumed control over the quarterly meetings, the churches, and the labors of the ministers, and the question of their ordination.|| After about twenty years, however, the churches became more independent.¶

As the denomination spread itself over a larger area, it was thought that another link was needed to complete the organization. The first General Conference was held at Tunbridge, Vermont, October, 1827. Nineteen delegates were present from New England, and one from New York. Rev. Enoch Place, who is still living, but was then in the prime of life, presided. Hosea Quinby, then a layman, and since then very useful both as a layman and a minister, was appointed clerk. Although the authority of the Conference was not at first very clearly defined, it was understood that it was not to reverse the decisions of the churches, or of the quarterly or the yearly meetings.**

The numerical increase of the Freewill Baptists during the first fifty years of their history is sufficiently indicated by a

* See Memoirs of David Marks, pages 37, 49, 59, 108.

† Hist., page 98. ‡ Ibid., pages 169, 180, 200.

§ Ibid., page 180. || Ibid., pages 169, 179, 197. ¶ Ibid., pages 267, 268.

** Ibid., page 437.

comparison of their statistics in 1790, about ten years after their origin, when they had quarterly meetings, 1 ; churches, 18 ; ordained ministers, 8 ; members, 400 : and in 1830, when they had yearly meetings, 7 ; quarterly meetings, 30 ; churches, 450 ; ordained ministers, 375 ; members, 21,000.*

In reaching these numbers, the denomination had passed through numerous trials. Its existence had scarcely begun, when, in 1782, the influence of the Shakers was so disastrous, that Mr. Stewart says, "Not one of the free churches but suffered more or less from their proselyting efforts."† In 1805, Elias Smith, the founder of what has since been known as "the *Christian* denomination," sought admission to "the Free-will Baptist Connexion." He believed that the soul is unconscious between death and the resurrection, and that the wicked will be annihilated. He denied the Divinity of Christ, and was opposed to "all written creeds and denominational names." Though not admitted, he continued in free intercourse with the Freewill Baptist churches, and this, with the circulation of *The Herald of Gospel Liberty* among them, exerted an injurious influence both as to doctrines and practices.‡ In 1809, came "the angel delusion,"§ and in 1817, Jacob Cochrane came flashing like a meteor, introducing his vagaries and immoralities,|| and leading many astray. These and other delusions, with the defection of various ministers whom Mr. Stewart names, were the causes of severe trials and losses.

We may here remark that the excitability of the Freewill Baptists of the present day is moderation in comparison with that of the first fifty years of their existence. Mr. Stewart describes scenes in connection with quarterly meetings and other gatherings, which to us seem to be very far removed from the decorum due to public worship. On one occasion, when "a table was spread for communion," there appears to have been so much confusion, "that there was no opportunity for receiving the elements."¶ At another time, Mr. Randall

* Hist., pages 94, 450. † Ibid. page 67.

‡ Ibid. pages 273, 342. § Ibid. 275. || Life of C. Phinney, pages 84, 85.

¶ Ibid. page 159.

"earnestly desired the people to refrain from such excited and disorderly manifestations."* This excitability will in part account for many being so easily led away, and for the large number of conversions reported, as compared with the actual increase of the denomination.

In contending against compulsory payments for the support of the ministry, Mr. Randall and his co-laborers went to the opposite extreme of objecting to "a stipulated agreement."† The result was, that those who were taught to make their feelings the test of what they should pay, readily felt that they should pay nothing. And those who thus taught, not only exposed themselves and families to privations, but placed great obstacles in the way of their successors. As a specimen, we may note that Messrs. B. Randall and J. Russell, by request, spent two weeks in travelling into Vermont and back, and received "about eighty cents," which they divided between them.‡ Theirs was not an uncommon experience. But however we may deprecate the mistake of these men, and the evils they introduced, we must believe them sincere, and would honor them for the earnestness with which they pursued their laborious and financially unrequited work.

At different periods we find females either active as exhorters, or believing themselves called to preach. We believe that at the present time there are two female preachers, wives of ordained ministers, one in Wisconsin, and the other in Iowa.

To counteract the influence of *The Herald of Gospel Liberty*, Rev. John Russell, in 1811, commenced *A Religious Magazine*. It was published two years, and then suspended till 1820, when the second volume was published, extending over three years. "*The Life of Colby*" was published in 1816, and after his death, a new edition, giving particulars of that event. In 1819, during the suspension of the *Religious Magazine*, Rev. Eben. Chase published *The Religious Informer*, a semi-monthly of eight pages, and it continued for several years. Rev. John Russell compiled and published a

* Hist., page 151. See also pages 223, 227, 240, 378.

† Ibid, pages 182, 183. ‡ Ibid. page 165.

hymn-book in 1823, and in 1825 Rev. Sam'l Burbank published the first *Freewill Baptist Register*, and it has since appeared annually. *The Freewill Baptist Magazine*, published in Rhode Island, was issued five years from 1826; and in 1827 the journal of Rev. Abel Thornton was published. The first number of their weekly newspaper, *The Morning Star*, was issued from Limerick, Maine, May 11th, 1826, so that it is now in its thirty-seventh year. In 1827, the *Morning Star* company published "*The Life of Elder Benjamin Randall*," and in 1828 they republished "*Pike's Persuasives to Early Piety*." This, we believe, completes the literary history of the denomination for the first fifty years, which may be called the formative period of its being.

As there is no promise of a continuation of Mr. Stewart's history at present, we append from various sources a few particulars of the last thirty years, which may be called the progressive stage of its course.

The General Conference was established in 1827, and is now held once in three years. While it does not claim to exercise any authority, it discusses various questions brought before it, and, composed as it is of delegates from the yearly meetings,* is supposed to speak authoritatively of the opinions and doctrinal views held by the denomination. The minutes of this Conference give us considerable insight into the questions agitated, and the enterprises carried on, in the denomination.

Of Sabbath Schools, a well informed minister says:† "Thirty-five years ago, there was scarcely a Sabbath School in the whole F. W. Baptist denomination. In 1828, the General Conference was held at Sandwich, N. H., and a vote was passed advising those who believed Sabbath Schools useful, to form them. You will see that the matter was not urged. There was then opposition to them in some places." But the General Conference soon took stronger ground, and Sabbath

*The yearly meetings are composed of delegates from the quarterly meetings, and these of delegates from the churches. †Rev. Jos. Fullonton, in *The Myrtle*, April 5th, 1862.

Schools became general. The *Sabbath School Repository* was published in 1841, but was discontinued at the end of a year. *The Myrtle*, a bi-monthly, was commenced in 1845, and now has a circulation of 13,500.

The question of writing sermons, or sketches of sermons, has often been discussed. In 1828, it was "Agreed that this Conference do not approve of writing sermons or sketches of sermons to deliver in public."* The last reference we find to this subject is in 1859. "Resolved, That we deem extemporaneous preaching most effective, and would recommend it to all our ministry; yet we would leave every minister to the liberty of his own conscience."†

In 1824, Rev. James Peggs,‡ and in 1832, Rev. A. Sutton,§ English General Baptist missionaries in Orissa, addressed letters to the Freewill Baptists of this country on the subject of missions to the heathen. In 1833, Mr. Sutton came to this country, and spent a number of months in visiting the churches. "The Freewill Baptist Foreign Mission Society" was formed the same year.§ Rev. Eli Noyes was ordained in a grove, at the New Hampshire Yearly Meeting in June, 1835, in the presence of three thousand persons, Rev. F. A. Cox, of London, preaching, and Rev. A. Sutton, of Orissa, giving the charge.¶ Mr. and Mrs. Noyes, with Rev. Jeremiah Phillips and wife, sailed for Orissa in company with Mr. Sutton, in September, 1835. Mr. Noyes was obliged to return home in 1841, in consequence of ill health, but Mr. Phillips remained till 1855. The Society has sent out, in all, twenty-one missionaries, male and female; five of whom now remain in Orissa. The missionary stations are Balasore and Jellasore. The number of members in 1860, at the former place was forty, and at the latter thirty-one. They have six native preachers, and one assistant native preacher.

Rev. C. R. Bachelier, who went out in 1840, and returned in 1852, established a dispensary,¶ and gave lectures to "a

*Minutes of General Conference, 1828, page 9. †Minutes, 1859, page 27.

‡History of Freewill Baptists, page 465. §Minutes, 1847, page 14.

¶Hinduism and Christianity in Orissa, page 121.

¶Report of Freewill Baptist Foreign Mission Society, 1835, page 5.

small medical class.”* The dispensary has averaged over two thousand patients annually for fifteen years, most of the labor being performed by one of Mr. B.’s students.† Since his return home, Mr. Bacheler has published “*Hinduism and Christianity in Orissa*.” Mr. Phillips reduced the Santal language to form, and published an introduction, grammar, vocabulary, and primer, and afterwards translated and published the Gospel of Matthew. The total amount of subscription for twenty-eight years, is \$101,832.32; and the annual average for the last eight years, \$4,868.37. All the secretaries of the Society have labored gratuitously, hence the incidental expenses have been very small. Rev. C. R. Bacheler is the present secretary.‡

The Freewill Baptists early took decided ground on “the temperance question.” In 1832, the General Conference voted, “We will lay hands on no man who uses them (ardent spirits), or advocates their use as a drink,”§ and they have constantly maintained this position.

Much “Home Missionary” labor had for a long time been performed in the denomination, but mainly at the expense of the laborers themselves. The establishment of the Foreign Mission Society in 1833 seems to have had a reflex influence, for in the following year the Freewill Baptist Home Mission Society was organized.|| For some years the principal work seems to have been the aiding of itinerant ministers, but in 1844 a missionary¶ was appointed to labor in Boston, Mass. From that time, while still caring for large and promising fields, the Society has directed more attention to churches. As nearly as we can gather from the reports, sixty-seven of these have been aided for a longer or shorter time. The total income for twenty-seven years is \$44,641.72.

In the last report we find two churches receiving each an

* *Hinduism and Christianity*, page 175. † Report of F. B. Foreign Mission Society, 1861, page 8.

‡ Since the above was written, Mr. Bacheler has returned to Orissa to remain three or more years. He sailed July 12th, leaving his family in this country. Rev. C. C. Libby, of Candia, N. H., is the present Secretary of the Society.

§ Minutes of Gen. Conference, 1832, page 6. || *Memoirs of David Marks*, page 325. ¶ Rev. Eli Noyes, a returned foreign missionary.

appropriation of \$500, for the year ; but in a recent article* by the Secretary of the Society† he says, "It has recently become the settled policy of the Society to make no more large appropriations to any one place." We observe that the Committee have hinted at an evil in the last report,‡ by suggesting that "our brethren, ministers and laymen, hereafter be *very cautious* about contracting debts for meeting houses."

In 1837, the Penobscot Yearly Meeting requested the General Conference to "consider the subject of honorary titles, such as D. D., etc." The Conference responded by voting, "That it be recommended to our brethren not to receive or adopt titles which may give any just occasion for the opinion that they seek honor one of another."§ We believe that thirteen years ago few ministers were willing to resist public opinion by using the prefix of Rev., the common term being Elder ; but there has been considerable change in this respect, and in 1853, when the subject was brought before the General Conference, they voted, "In our opinion, no action on the subject by this Conference is needed."||

The year 1839 is considered by Freewill Baptists to have been an era with them on the subject of slavery. The General Conferences had before this passed strong resolutions in opposition thereto, but in this year, a Dr. Wm. H. Housley, of Kentucky, came to the General Conference, and stated that if he were received into the denomination and ordained, several churches would also unite with them. But as he was a slaveholder, the counsel who examined him declined his application, and the Conference approved of their decision.¶ The Churches in North Carolina, containing three thousand members, probably on account of the position of the denomination respecting slavery,** not having reported themselves for several years, it was this year "voted, that in future the North Carolina Conference be not inserted in our statistics.††

* *Morning Star*, April 16th, 1862. † Rev. Silas Curtis. ‡ Report of F. B. Home Mission Society, 1861, page 25. § Minutes of General Conference, 1837, page 18.

|| Minutes of Gen. Conference, 1853, page 35. ¶ Ibid, 1839, page 25. ** Free-will Baptist Quarterly, 1860, page 96. †† Minutes of Gen. Conference, 1839, page 32.

Whatever may have been the views of Mr. Randall and other early ministers,* there can be no doubt that afterwards there was a general dislike of an intelligent ministry, and any educational preparation for preaching was supposed to indicate neglect of the teaching of the Holy Spirit. A Freewill Baptist minister yet living, states, that being settled as a pastor in East Ossipee, N. H., from 1826 to 1831, he with great economy saved enough to purchase a Commentary. For a time he was able to keep it secret, but at length a female visitor discovered his hidden treasure, and in a few days the whole society knew it. He says: "If I had had the small pox packed away in a book-case, I am not sure that the excitement would have been any greater than in the present instance."† The result was, the church no longer had confidence in him, and he had to seek a new field of labor. Another aged minister says: "My whole library consisted of a pocket Bible and a hymn-book. . . . I borrowed some histories, yet had but little time to read them — was reproved severely by the senior minister of the Church for reading. He called it studying to be a minister. He would sometimes tell me that it would ruin my usefulness to study anything but the Bible — he wished all other books piled up in one pile, and he would crawl half a mile on his hands and knees to set them on fire."‡

But in the midst of this love for "darkness rather than light," there were both ministers and laymen who were restless and uneasy, and who, although they found a spiritual home with this denomination, could not be satisfied with the intellectual atmosphere by which they were surrounded. The first educational effort in the denomination was the establishment of an Academy at Parsonsfield, Maine, in 1832.§ In January, 1840, the Freewill Baptist Education Society was formed, and in September of that year "the Biblical School was set in operation at North Parsonsfield, Me., under the instruction of M. M. Smart, as Principal."|| It has since been

*History of the Freewill Baptists., page 467. †Life of Rev. D. Jackson, page 43. ‡Report of F. B. Education Society, 1853, page 6. §Minutes of Gen. Conference, 1832, page 21. Memoirs of David Marks, page 286. ||Report of F. B. Education Society, 1851, page 7.

located at Lowell, Mass., and Whitestown, N. Y., and is now at New Hampton, N. H. It is now called "The Theological School." We are informed that "from the commencement, the whole number of students has been about two hundred and fifty — only thirty of whom have graduated in the regular course, though many others studied nearly long enough to do so."* Since 1855, appropriations have been made to indigent students for the ministry. Last year \$803 was distributed among thirty-three students.† In 1845, we find an objection to the School met by the statement, "There are no regulations requiring that they (the students) must necessarily remain any definite period of time in their course of study ; but they may continue one year, or two, or three, or any number of months simply, as convictions of duty shall dictate."‡ We think this arrangement has interfered with the efficiency of the School; but, perhaps, in the peculiar circumstances in which it was commenced, this was the best that could be done. Notwithstanding "the storm that rose at the time of the organization of the Education Society,"§ the founders and supporters persevered in their work, and by the blessing of God have raised a noble monument to their perseverance.

The report of the Education Society for 1858 states : "The whole number of pupils in attendance during the year at our various institutions, is estimated at 1,800. The amount of funds invested is about \$250,000. Of this sum, \$110,000 are in the form of permanent funds." The most munificent friend of the Society was the late Jotham Parsons, of New York, who gave \$15,000 to aid ministerial education.¶ Rev. S. K. Moulton is the present Secretary.

In 1841, a denomination in New York calling themselves "Free Baptists," with whom there had been correspondence for several years, united with the Freewill Baptists, on condition that they should be allowed to retain their original name,

*Com. from Rev. J. J. Butler, D. D. †Report of F. B. Ed. Soc., 1861, page 20. ‡Ibid. 1845, page 11. §Ibid. 1855, page 4. ¶Freewill Baptist Quarterly, 1861, page 466.

if they chose.* This added 55 churches, 37 ordained ministers, and 2,534 members. With reference to the name, Mr. Stewart says: "Many would prefer Free Baptists"† for the whole denomination.

In 1847, Revs. Jabez Burns and James Goadby attended the General Conference as a deputation from the General Baptists of England. Dr. Burns published an interesting volume‡ on his return. By appointment of the Conference, Revs. Jonathan Woodman and Eli Noyes reciprocated the visit in 1848.

In 1859, an obelisk of Italian marble, ten feet high, on a granite base, was erected over the grave of Rev. B. Randall, at New Durham, N. H., at the expense of the denomination.

The denomination reached its maximum of members in 1843,§ when it numbered 61,372, but the Advent excitement sprung up about that time, and in the next four years there was a loss of between nine and ten thousand.|| Its statistics in 1860 were, Yearly Meetings 31, Quarterly Meetings 145, Churches 1286, Ordained Ministers 1022, Members 58,441. The writer in the Quarterly from whom we have just quoted, believes that the Freewill Baptists suffered from the Advent excitement more than any other denomination, except the *Christians*, because next to them, they cultivated the "emotional nature," and neglected education and literature. With the progress of education in the denomination there has been a corresponding development of literary ability and fertility in its ministry, and of intelligence and stability in its membership. Its "Printing Establishment," which publishes, besides denominational books, the *Morning Star*, a weekly newspaper, and the *Freewill Baptist Quarterly*, has yielded at different times considerable sums of money to various benevolent objects of the body, and held in 1859 a property estimated at more than

* Minutes of General Conference, 1841, page 5.

† History of Freewill Baptists, page 176.

‡ Notes of a tour in the United States and Canada, by J. Burns, D. D.

§ Minutes of General Conference, 1859, page 39.

|| Freewill Baptist Quarterly, 1856, page 424.

\$49,000. Its Quarterly, however, has not been a profitable enterprise, the contributors for the most part writing for it gratuitously. Some of its articles have been highly creditable to their authors.

But we must turn to the doctrines held by the Freewill Baptists. In 1832 the General Conference appointed a committee "to write a treatise on our sentiments."* This small work, containing 176 pages 48mo, was published in 1834, and has been several times endorsed by the General Conference.† In 1843, Rev. M. M. Smart, then Principal of "the Biblical School," published at Lowell, Mass., a work entitled "*Biblical Doctrine*." We do not find any reference to this in the Minutes of General Conference, and we are informed that it was not "much used in the denomination."

We have now the work of Dr. Butler, of which the *Freewill Baptist Quarterly*‡ says, it is "issued under the auspices of the Freewill Baptist denomination, and is likely to be accepted, both within and without that body, as containing the doctrinal standard and formulæ of its churches." The work consists of a course of lectures which the author has delivered to his Theological classes, and is published, both as a text book for them, and to supply a want long felt in the denomination. If the author does not always convince us, he succeeds in letting us know what he believes; and while we differ from him as to the meaning of certain texts, we find throughout the work a disposition to rely implicitly on what he thinks the Bible teaches. He gives the views of opponents with candor and fairness usually quoting their words. Our readers will not expect us either to controvert or approve the doctrines advanced, our present object being simply to state, as concisely and perspicuously as we can, what we understand to be the distinctive doctrines held by the Freewill Baptists.

The first lecture is introductory, and in treating of the Christian ministry, and the importance of theological training, the author takes occasion to answer the peculiar errors that

* Minutes, 1832, page 9. † Ibid. 1836, 1847, 1853. ‡ 1861, page 232.

have been so prevalent among his people on these subjects. On page 29 we observe what we suppose to be a misprint. Of "Christian Theology" we read, "It may be remarked *that one* great source of instruction is the Bible." This reading would imply that there are other great sources of instruction in "Christian theology" besides the Bible; but we suppose that Dr. B. must have intended to say "*the one* great source." If not an error of type, which we are confident it must be, it certainly is a fundamental error in doctrine.

The work is divided into four parts, entitled, respectively, Natural Theology, Necessity and Authority of Scripture Revelation, The Doctrines of Revelation, The Church and its Institutions. The whole is comprised in forty-three lectures. We shall refer only to those lectures which enunciate the peculiar Freewill views. In Lecture IV., vindicating the consistency of human freedom with Divine omniscience, he affirms that "our acts are not performed because God knows them, but God knows them because they are performed." "God knows that moral beings have the power of contrary choice, for he has endowed them with that power. Else they would not be moral beings." He admits that "the knowledge of God is dependent on our acts, so far as that knowledge relates to our acts. But this implies no limit of his knowledge."

Lecture XI., "On Christ," opens a subject on which there has been much discussion in the denomination, arising, probably, from a too close connection with the *Christians*,* and the indiscriminate reading of their periodical.† But in the discussions of the General Conference, and in the first general statement of doctrines already referred to, we see that the leading men have always avoided the errors thus introduced among them. Dr. Butler states that Christ "was really a man having a natural body and a rational soul," and that "He was God."‡ "But He was not two beings. He was one being. Divinity and humanity were then united in the person of

* History of the Freewill Baptists, page 342.

† Ibid. page 272.

‡ Theology, page 114.

Christ.”* To the phrase, “Son of God the idea generally attached in the Scriptures is that of *office*. It designates the Messiah :” and that in his capacity of Messiah or Mediator, the Son was sent by the Father, and was subordinate to him.”†

Incorrect views on the subject of the Divinity of Christ would naturally be connected with objections to the doctrine of the Trinity, and some who might have all doubts on the former subject removed, might find them remaining on the latter. Thus one who for many years was a leading Freewill minister in New England, and now resides in Indiana, appears to have adopted the Sabellian theory, for he says of God,‡ that “in order to meet the wants of the moral world, he has revealed himself to man in a threefold sense ; or, in other words, in the relative offices of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.”

But Dr. Butler, in Lecture XII., “On the Trinity,” says, “The Scriptures clearly reveal a trinity in unity in the Godhead—that is, there is but one God, one Divine being ; yet in his infinite nature there are three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. He is three, yet but one, though not in the same sense.”§ “To reject it is to reject the Bible. But what the distinction is, denoted by *persons* in the Godhead, we may frankly confess we know not. . . . The doctrine is one of pure revelation, and should be received just as it stands in the sacred oracles.”|| After adducing a number of texts with reference to the Holy Spirit, Dr. B. says, “These passages clearly prove both the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit.”¶

Lecture XIV. treats of “Divine Purposes and Providence.” It is stated that there are, “1. Unconditional decrees ; as, to create the world, to give Christ, to make atonement. 2. Conditional decrees ; as, to save those who endure in obedience

* Theol. page 118.

† Page 119.

‡ Life of Rev. D. Jackson, page 90.

§ Theol. page 122.

|| Page 131.

¶ Page 124.

to him to the end, to cast off those who persist in impenitence.”* And, it is added, “Thus is the decree, so far as it relates to moral beings, conditioned, and founded in God’s foreknowledge of the free acts of his accountable creatures. Every man is therefore responsible for himself, and the author of his own destiny.”† On the subject of Providence it is said, “That the Providence of God is universal, . . . extends to the most *minute* objects and events, . . . secures the *highest welfare* of the universe on the whole, . . . is adapted to *the nature of different objects*,” and “does not at all infringe upon the moral agency of any one.”‡

In Lecture XV. we have “Moral Agency” discussed. Here we are taught that “Moral distinctions are as immutable as mathematical distinctions ;” that moral law “is immutable and independent of the will of any being whatever. That benevolence is right and selfishness is wrong, arise from no enactment or constitution of things.” “A moral being is one subject to moral law.” “We are moral beings.”§ “In the fall man did not lose his moral agency.”|| “Free Will. This is the power of contrary choice, or self-determination. It is *the* efficient power of the mind. In fact, will is the only proper *cause* in the universe. The will of God is the great first cause, and it is by virtue of the will that He is cause. Created moral beings are second causes, and it is by virtue of the will that they are causes.”¶ “Will is therefore free, that is, self-determined. In every moral choice, other circumstances apart from itself remaining the same, the will might have made a different or opposite choice. . . . Intellect, moral sensibilities, conscience, and will, then, constitute moral agency. All are essential to it, though the will is more especially the moral faculty.”** The *cannot* of sinners is their will not.”††

Respecting Lecture XVI., “On the creation and original state of man,” we need only say, that it teaches the immateriality and immortality of the soul, and states, as the general belief, “that the intimations both of Scripture and reason favor the theory of the propagation of the soul.”‡‡

* Page 152. † Page 153. ‡ Page 155. § Page 150. || Page 161.

¶ Page 163. ** Page 167. †† Page 168. ‡‡ Page 178.

In Lecture XVII., "Temptation and Fall of Man,"* it is stated that "fallen man cannot recover himself, he cannot regenerate himself, he cannot, while remaining in a sinful state, exercise holy affections ; but he can do his duty, and what he cannot do of himself alone, he can accomplish through the influences of the Holy Spirit. He can yield to those influences. He can obey God."†

Lecture XIX. is on "Human Depravity." Here we have such statements as these : "There is not a man upon earth; there never was one, who can say with a clear conscience, I never sinned."‡ "It is not mere improvement that he (man) needs, but *moral transformation*, . . . human depravity is *universal*, . . . it is total."§ "No unrenewed man, then possesses any degree of holiness, but is wholly depraved."||

With reference to the state of infants, Rev. J. B. Davis, a prominent Freewill Baptist minister, says, in a sermon published by request of the Rhode Island Quarterly Meeting, that on account of "the soul of the infant being in an impure body, and sinful world, it becomes exposed to all the temptations and sins of this life, and might fall in with them, and finally be cast away. . . . The soul of the infant being pure and without sin, it needs not regeneration or faith, but is saved without either."¶ We find, however, in the only sermon published by Rev. Benj. Randall, "that we all sinned and fell with and in Adam," and "little children are in a state of depravity," yet "not in a state of condemnation." **

Dr. Butler says: "We admit they are not guilty of actual sin, for they are not capable of it. But they have a fallen nature, a corrupt propensity," And he asks, "If children are good by nature, could not one, at least, have been trained up holy?"†† He denies, "that the evil is confined wholly or chiefly to the body,"‡‡ and says : "All the moral powers pertain to the soul. The body is but the instrument of the mind."§§

* page 184, 185. † page 186. ‡ page 197. § page 199. || page 200.
¶ Moral and physical state of Infants, 1849, page 14. ** A Sermon delivered February 27, 1803, by Benjamin Randall, pages 7, 8. †† page 202.
‡‡ page 203. §§ page 204.

Lecture XX. treats of the "Nature and Extent of the Atonement." Dr. B. says : "The sufferings of Christ were *vicarious*, that is, in our stead."* The Scriptures "represent his sufferings as an *equivalent* for those of sinners, so that by this provision the authority of the law is sustained equally as if all had been left to perish."† "The atonement is a gracious provision, made to render it proper for God to pardon the guilty. Without it not a sinner could have been pardoned. . . . And the same provision that opened the way for the pardon of one, opened the way for the pardon of all."‡ "The atonement was provided for all, and if any are lost, it is because they reject its overtures."§

The subject of Lecture XXI., "Justification," has been much discussed in the denomination, and a leading minister has written : "The reaction from papal errors in respect to works seems to have driven Protestants into the opposite error of justification by faith alone."|| But Dr. Butler says : "The doctrine of justification by faith is taught in every part of the Scriptures."¶ "Paul's doctrine is, that the sinner is justified by faith, not by works. . . . James is opposing those who are relying on a mere speculative or dead faith."** "Christ is the *ground* of hope. . . . Faith is the condition on which pardon is bestowed."††

Lectures XXV., XXVI., are on "the Nature of Regeneration," and "the Means and Evidences of Regeneration." Dr. B. describes "the process that occurs in regeneration,"‡‡ as deep conviction of sin, repentance, faith in Christ, unreserved consecration to God. "Two agencies are concerned in regeneration—the agency of God and that of man. Both are indispensable."§§ "We are authorized to say that the Holy Spirit regenerates, and that he uses means." But "the Bible plainly teaches that the Spirit's influence is not irresistible."||| "The sinner has, indeed, an indispensable part to act, or he will never be regenerated."¶¶ "In the order of nature (not of

* page 217. † page 222. ‡ page 225. § page 227. || Rev. G. H. Ball in *Freewill Baptist Quarterly*, 1860, page 73. ¶ page 234. ** page 235. †† page 236. ‡‡ page 260. §§ page 261. ||| page 266. ¶¶ page 267,

time), acceptable prayer, repentance, and faith, in their restricted sense, precede regeneration."*

Perhaps it will not be out of place to suggest here that what Andrew Fuller† said of Rev. Dan'l Taylor, may be applied to Dr. Butler. He "seems to think that *regeneration* includes the *whole change* that is brought about upon a person in order to his being denominated a true Christian, and not merely the *first beginning* of it."

In Lecture XXVII., "On Election," Dr. B. says, "the purpose of God in reference to the salvation of individuals is in Scripture founded on his foreknowledge. God is omniscient. He knows who will comply with the terms of the gospel, and who will reject them, and purposes to dispose of them accordingly. This is Bible election and reprobation."‡ He quotes from Dick, the Arminian view of "election," and says of it, "Every part of this doctrine is clearly authorized by the Scriptures."§ In closing, he adds: "For an individual to be one of the elect is, in the Scriptural view, to be one of the children of God. On the matter of salvation, this is its full import."||

In Lecture XXIX., "Perseverance of Saints," the views of Dr. Butler are thus stated. "The last position is, that *salvation is throughout conditional*; that voluntary obedience to the end is the condition of salvation to every one; and that the Scriptures afford no sufficient warrant for teaching that all who are once regenerated, do hold out to the end, and obtain salvation."¶ "The passage (Hebrews vi: 4-6) shows that true believers are in *real danger* of final apostacy and ruin. There is no other way of salvation but through faith in Christ; and if any renounce this, they are without hope." Backsliders "may perish in their revolt, grieve away the Holy Spirit, and seal their own destruction."**

Lecture XXX. treats of "Death and the Intermediate State," and we find the position distinctly taken, that "At death the soul . . . is introduced into a state of conscious, mental and

* page 269. † Complete works. London Edition, page 235.

‡ page 289. § page 303. || page 309. ¶ page 311. ** page 318.

moral activity. . . . The opposite doctrine, the unconscious sleep of the dead, is, in no form, taught or implied in any of the proof-texts adduced by its advocates to sustain it.”*

Lecture XXXI. is on the “final State of Rewards and Punishments.” In consequence of their intercourse with the *Christian* denomination, the notion of “the annihilation of the wicked” has often troubled the Freewill Baptists. It gave Mr. Randall much anxiety, and in his “last letter,” a short time before his death, he said : “There is that new-fangled doctrine—the final end of the wicked, (or that they will finally cease to be),—preached by some said to be of this connection, which, I think, should not be allowed.”† The General Conference has more than once pronounced it “a fundamental error.”‡

Dr. Butler says : “The wicked shall, indeed, be destroyed, perish, descend to perdition; not that they will cease from a conscious existence; but be banished from God, separated from good, involved in tribulation and anguish forever. On this point, the Bible is explicit and conclusive.”§

Lecture XXXIV. is entitled “Constitution of the Church.” There have been several attempts to form union churches, composed in part of unbaptized Christians, and it was reported to the General Conference of 1847 that five such churches had been formed. The Conference, however, on more than one occasion, have expressed their decided disapproval of this course.¶ Dr. Butler says : “The gospel condition of membership is a credible evidence and profession of faith in Christ. . . . We would not contend that baptism alone makes one a member, but, according to the Scriptures, this is always to be required.”¶ The appendix to “the Treatise,” says, candidates for membership are “required to give satisfactory evidence of having experienced a change of

* History of the Freewill Baptists, page 247.

† Minutes of General Conference, 1831, page 5 ; 1850, page 38.

‡ page 350.

§ Minutes of General Conference, 1847, page 10 ; 1853, page 36.

¶ page 362.

¶ Usages of the Freewill Baptist Connexion, page 11.

heart by the Spirit of God, and must receive the ordinance of baptism."*

As respects "the Government and Discipline of the Church," the subject of Lecture XXXV., our readers will have already seen that the Freewill Baptists came gradually to the possession of their present views. These views, as stated by Dr. B., are, that "Each church is independent in the management of its internal affairs. Churches have a right to form associations," but "all associations should originate with the churches. . . . The authority of these associations is not simply *advisory*. While they have no control of the internal affairs of the churches, yet within their proper province they have all the power that any ecclesiastical body can have. . . . But no appeal can be prosecuted from one body to another, so as to reverse the action of the other."†

In Lecture XLII., "The Lord's Supper" Dr. B. says: "The main design of the Lord's Supper is . . . a memorial of Christ. . . . A secondary object of the ordinance is to maintain the fellowship of the saints."‡ "The apostles admitted all Christians to the Lord's Supper. We must do the same, if we would follow their example."§

While the practice of what is called "open communion" is universal among Freewill Baptists, there has been much discussion among them as to the form of invitation. A large number have insisted that "all Christians," whether members of churches, or otherwise, should be invited. This subject has been discussed at a number of "General Conferences." Sometimes it has been evaded,|| but in 1859, it was,

"Resolved, That administrators ought to secure of all candidates satisfactory evidence of true piety by personal acquaintance, by the testimony of others, or by the membership of such candidates in churches requiring true piety in their members."

Dr. Butler says: "The proper course, as we conceive, is to invite all Christians, or gospel believers in regular standing in any evangelical church. . . . The practice of some in

*Theology, pages 367, 368.

† page 420. ‡ page 425. § Minutes of General Conference, 1850, page 38.

|| Ibid. 1859, page 30.

allowing professed converts before uniting with the church, rejected members of other churches, and, indeed, almost any, to come to the Lord's table, is to be condemned. . . . None have a right to the privileges of this ordinance but gospel believers. . . . All such have the right, and should on no account be prohibited."*

Such are the principal distinctive doctrines, now held by the Freewill Baptists. There are, of course, some of these, from which we should wholly dissent, which we cannot but regard as erroneous and injurious, while there are others which we are glad to find so nearly in accordance with what we believe to be the teaching of the Bible. We heartily rejoice in the manifest and manifold signs of progress in the denomination, and wish it a God-speed in the fulfilment of its appointed course. The later years of its history have been entirely creditable to the intelligence and piety of its leading minds. Its educational enterprises are worthy of all praise, and the more so, when it is remembered that its ministers were the first to contribute, with great self-denial, from their scanty funds to the endowment of their first institution. Should education, both ministerial and general, be still more widely diffused among them, and they thus be surrounded with those defences against the incursion of error and fanaticism which education will furnish; and should their missionary zeal keep pace with their growing intelligence, then will the service of the Freewill Baptists to the common cause of Christianity be such as all true Christians will recognize with heartiness and joy.

* Theology, page 429.

DOES THE BIBLE SUSTAIN SLAVERY?

[BY M. E. F., BOONVILLE, N. Y.]

It is not proposed to enter into a critical, philological discussion of words or phrases, but, accepting the Bible account in its natural construction, with the interpretation which the Scriptures, as a *whole*, in their proper spirit, fix upon particular passages, to inquire, whether the Bible, God's word of truth to man, sustains, in the least, the enslavement of any person, or even the curtailing of his rights or freedom by any other person, without his free, intelligent consent as to what, how far, and how long he puts himself under the control of another. That a person may yield the control of his time, his capabilities, both physical and mental, to another to be used in any legitimate sphere, for that other person's benefit, will not be denied; but *no one* can abnegate, or put away, or in any wise dispossess himself of his proper soul-individuality, his personal responsibility, his moral accountability to God and to man, for any consideration, under any circumstances, during even the shortest time. "For as it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue confess to God: so, then, *every one* of us shall give account of *himself* to God," (Rom. xiv: 11, 12.) Can there be a compulsory transfer of a man's individual moral accountability in any part or sense to another? Does the Bible give or acknowledge the right of a forcible subjection? The attempt has often been made through a hypercritical respect for the ancient Greek, and by a misapplication of the strict classic import of words to the New Testament idiom, to foist slavery upon a Scripture platform, but it has been, and must ever be, a signal failure. The moral convictions of Christians

sustained by the majesty and power of God's onward-marching providence, are not to be overridden, nor stayed, nor even perceptibly influenced by any such studied efforts to make God the supporter of wrong and oppression.

Yet there may be, and doubtless are, many who entertain a half-forced conviction that the Bible does in some way and to some extent give countenance to the system of slavery, or at least does not condemn it as unchristian and wrong; and many others, perchance, who feel that Bible-principles and slavery-principles are utterly and hopelessly antagonistic, whose inward convictions revolt at regarding the compassionate Jesus as even a silent apologist for such a system, may yet feel a difficulty in meeting the arguments urged, though those arguments fail either to convince their understanding, or win their hearts. If this article shall assist any one of either of these classes more clearly to apprehend the truth, or more understandingly to defend the principles of Bible-teaching upon this subject, it will not be wholly useless.

That Revelation as an objective fact has also been for nearly eighteen centuries an accomplished, a perfected fact, few, probably, will deny. The Old Testament canon of Revelation was such an accomplished objective fact for several hundred years before Christ. But from the writing of Genesis till the present, there has been a gradually advancing development of Scripture truth, a steadily increasing knowledge of Bible-teaching, a kind of subjective revelation of the real principles of the divine government to the conscious apprehension of men. There is, then, first, an objective revelation, outside and independent of man's apprehension or acceptance — a fact accomplished, whether men believe, or disbelieve, as much a fact to the infidel as to the Christian. And, second, a growing development of the principles and truths contained in such objective revelation — a kind of subjective revelation of Bible doctrines to man's spiritual apprehension, to the grasp of his intellectual conception. The first a perfected work: the second ever advancing toward the first, yet never passing beyond. The first as perfect and complete when the canon of the New Testament closed, nearly

eighteen hundred years ago, as it ever will, or can be. The second more complete now than then, and to be more complete hereafter than now.

Thus it was that the indissoluble nature of the marriage relation, and the oneness of man and wife were declared within the first week of creation; not only in the act of creation, but in a declared precept (Gen. ii: 23, 24); yet four thousand years elapsed before men came up to a practical apprehension and acceptance of that very principle, though it lies at the very foundation of all social purity and elevation; and even then the positive word of the Son of God, that nothing save actual crime against the very heart-element of that bond could ever dissolve it, was necessary to secure its full adoption (Matt. v: 32.) Yet will any intelligent person, reading the Old Testament understandingly, affirm that it teaches and sustains polygamy and indiscriminate divorce-ment, because, in the earlier development of Scripture truth, such things were allowed because of man's ignorance of moral requirements, because of their "hardness of heart?" (Matt. xix: 8.)

It was but yesterday, as it were, when men of all classes, even gospel ministers, freely used intoxicating beverages, and it was esteemed disreputable not to use them; and to-day we have scarcely learned the laws of temperance, much less put them in practice, yet twenty-five hundred years ago God had thundered his malediction and woe not only upon drunkards, but also upon the makers of drunkards, upon dealers and consumers (Isai. v: 11, &c.; Hab. ii: 15, &c.) And for centuries before even that point, the essential elements and principles, which were thus jointly expressed, had found place in Scripture. (Lev. x: 9, 10; Num. vi: 4, 5.) A priest might drink "no wine, nor strong drink," when performing God's service, yet Christians are a "royal priesthood," continually serving God. (I Peter ii: 9.) So, also, the Nazarite separated to God, might partake of nothing that came from the vine. These principles, truly developed, show that intoxicating beverages were and are inconsistent with religion, with God's service; and if inconsistent with such service, then wrong

and sinful. And what man knowing anything of Scripture would attempt to uphold, from the Bible, the dealing in or using of such beverages? The bare attempt would prove him a knave or an ignoramus. Still their use was allowed in olden times and upon the same principle as were polygamy and divorcement.

Thus, also, the command of the law, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," Lev. xix: 18, expressed a principle which had then existed thousands of years, which was coeval with man's existence, nevertheless fifteen hundred years after, the beautiful parable of the "Good Samaritan" was required to set forth and illustrate its meaning and application. And now eighteen centuries more have elapsed, and we have not yet fully learned the principle, nor the parable illustrating the principle. We do not yet fully apprehend the neighborly love so touchingly manifest in that "certain Samaritan." But we need not multiply illustrations to prove the existence of this progressive and subjective revelation of the objective revelation of Scripture; it is too apparent to be denied.

Now let us examine the teachings of the Bible upon servitude, under the light of this very simple principle. It will not be necessary to discuss the exact peculiarities of Hebrew servitude, as this has been done by abler pens. No Hebrew might have a brother Hebrew as a "bond servant." (Lev. xxv: 39-42.) The brotherhood between *all* the different members of the nation forbade any such relation. Strangers and aliens might be bond-servants. (Lev. xxv: 44-46.) But these, even as Israel's sons, were taken into covenant as his people, (Deut. xxix: 10-13,) being circumcised. (Gen. xvii: 12, 13.) They were instructed in religious duties and requirements as all others (Deut. xxxi: 10-13; Josh. viii: 33-35); the same law was over both master and servant—the Israelite and the stranger; and the civil rights and religious privileges were subject to the same rules (Deut. i: 16, 17—xxvii: 19; Lev. xxiv: 22; Num. xv: 15, 16, 29—ix: 14); while continually God is represented as having no respect to persons in his dealing, not favoring high or low, rich or poor, but judging each according to moral character, (II. Chron. xix: 7; Job xxxiv:

19), and enjoining the same upon all. The Hebrew servant went out free the seventh year (Ex. xxi: 2; Deut. xv: 12); and all others in the fiftieth year—the year of Jubilee (Lev. xxv: 10, 54.)

Now, if the bearing of these principles, in their true scope and meaning, be considered, we keep in mind also the following precepts, “Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the *servant* which is escaped from his master unto thee, he shall dwell with thee, even among you in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him” (Deut. xxiii: 15, 16.) “And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death” (Ex. xxi: 16); it will be seen that these principles and precepts gradually but surely subvert any and every condition of servitude, especially such a condition as the Jewish, where many incidental elements and principles entered in, to hasten the advancement of such a knowledge of and obedience to the real spirit of the law, as should forever put an end to the system. Nor were these principles to be a dead letter upon their statute-books. (Ex. xxi: 20; Jere. xxxiv: 8–22.) They were to be carried out at the peril of God’s severe displeasure and punishment. (Neh. v: 13.) The single principle of brotherhood—the fact that a brother by nationality or race could not be a bond-servant—when fully developed, when viewed in its true significance, would have been and is sufficient to overthrow the whole system of bond-service. For since God “hath made of one blood all nations of men” (Acts xvii: 26), we are all brothers of one inseparable, indivisible family. Join the other principles, and the result is hastened.

And actual Jewish practice sustain this theoretical truth; since long before the coming of Christ every vestige of servitude had vanished from the Jewish nation. In this respect, their assertion to Jesus was doubtless correct: “We be Abraham’s seed, and were never in bondage to any man.” (John viii: 33.) Even so partial a development of the principles underlying Old Testament revelation, as had then taken place, was sufficient to make the Jews a free nation,

and Jubilee met Jubilee in sounding songs of perpetual freedom. How much more, then, do those principles, underlying and breathing through the Old Testament canon, "proclaim liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof," and proclaim it to us, who are in the light of so great a development of Scripture-truth—who have known so much of the subjective revelation of divine teaching. There can be no support for slavery, or servitude of any kind, in any degree incompatible with man's fullest individual freedom, drawn from the Old Testament, at this advanced stage of subjective revelation. To attempt it is as absurd as to attempt to uphold intemperance, polygamy, or indiscriminate divorcement from the same books of divine truth and love. It is labor in vain! It is fighting against God!

But does the New Testament sustain the system? It is said: "Christ never specifically, in so many words, abrogated the laws of servitude." Neither ought it to be expected. For the advancing light and truth of the underlying principles of Old Testament revelation had already abrogated and done away with those permits and regulations of a service which was never intended to be any thing more than temporary. The same is true in regard to temperance; Christ did not formally condemn intemperance. But Christ did reiterate those very principles whose early development uprooted the whole system of Jewish servitude: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," (Matt. xxii: 39.) "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them; for *this* is the *law* and the *prophets*" (Matt. vii: 12.) See also the parable of the good Samaritan (Luke x: 30—37) and other passages. Any formal abrogation of such rules as had already been long abolished by the true spirit and teaching of the earlier dispensation, would have been altogether out of place and superfluous. For his Jewish auditors there was no need of such repetition; and for others it was sufficient, and far more harmonious and accordant with the general principle of revelation, to reiterate and establish, beyond question or doubt, those principles and teachings which had uprooted one, and would uproot all other

systems of servitude. Hence we find those principles repeated with Christ's sanction and approval, but no formal denial of those things which had already received the denial of overthrow and reprobation. And this principle applies to other things than servitude also.

But what did the Apostles practice and teach? That some of them, at least, came in actual contact with Roman slavery cannot be denied. That they had to do with real slaves, and real masters, in that sense of those terms which comes nearest to their present meaning, is quite possible, if not altogether probable. That both slave and master might have been church members—might have been Christians—at one and the same time, is among the things likely, perhaps, to occur. These may even be admitted as probable, or even actual facts, without much of danger—perchance without getting far from the real truth. But there are other facts which demand attention, and which may explain, perhaps modify, these admitted facts; which, at least, sustain important relations to them. The gospel was then in its infancy, as it were, making advances into Pagan nations, against Pagan customs and institutions. The canon of New Testament Scripture was not yet complete—not yet closed. New Testament revelation, even as an objective fact, was not finished—not yet perfected—it was yet advancing. The Apostles then sustained the same essential position, in reference to the present, as did Moses and the Prophets to the times succeeding their mission, whether immediately or remotely. All inspired Scripture teachers held essentially the same position relative to the present, though hundreds of years may have separated their individual standpoints. And if so, doubtless the same essential principle entered into their practice and teaching, only the development of these principles corresponds to their respective standpoints.

Admit, then, that there is no formal, specific, positive assertion that slavery is antagonistic to and incompatible with Christianity. Neither is there any such affirmation that it is *friendly* to or in harmony with the religion of Christ: and the latter fact, connected with previous Scripture teaching,

will, on any fair principles of interpretation, certainly offset, if not overbalance the former. The fact that all previous Bible revelation, in its true scope of advancing application, was opposed to and subversive of all servitude, would rather necessitate a positive precept in its favor, if in the Apostles' time it was to be adopted as friendly to Christianity — as permanently consistent with Christ's religion. Yet no such precept is given. But a direct, positive precept against it, as opposed to the Bible, would scarcely be expected, since the whole tone of revealed truth was just such a declaration of its opposition. But *these* precepts are found, "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and *not* to men; knowing that whatsoever good thing *any man* doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. And ye masters, do the *same things* unto *them*, forbearing threatening; knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there *respect of persons* with *Him*" (Eph. vi: 5—9). "Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh: not with eye-service, as men-pleasers: but in singleness of heart, fearing God." "Masters, give unto your servants *that which is just and equal*; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven," (Col. iii: 22; iv: 41). "Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things, not answering again; not purloining, but showing all good fidelity: that they *may adorn* the *doctrine* of *God* our Saviour" (Tit. ii: 9, 10). "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear: not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thank-worthy, if a *man* for conscience toward God endure *grief, suffering wrongfully*" (I. Pet. ii: 18, 19). "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrines be not blasphemed" (1 Tim. vi: 1). "Art thou called being a servant? care not for it; but if thou mayest be *made free*, use it rather. Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the

servants of men" (I. Cor. vii: 21, 23). "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for man-slayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for *men-stealers*, for liars, for perjured persons," &c. (I. Tim. ii: 9, 10.)

Now, granting that the terms "servants" and "masters" in each of these several cases mean essentially the same as is now meant by "slaves" and "masters," of which many have serious and perchance rational doubts, and what does it show? That servants were exhorted to obedience in their then condition, through regard to their relation to God, and by motives drawn, not at all from the justice of the relation sustained to "masters," *but* from the justice and impartiality of God, who would give to them according to their inner life, whatever they might endure, "suffering wrongfully" here; yet encouraging them to *become free* if they might, and not be "servants of men." While masters were enjoined to do the "same things to them" as had been enjoined upon the servants: and again, "Masters, give your servants that which is *just and equal*," and also "forbear threatening, because ye also have a Master in heaven, who does not respect persons" in his judgments. These very principles alone,—the "giving just and equal things" to servants, and the doing the "same things to them," or things regulated by the same principles, prompted by the same motives,—would, in their proper and legitimate development and application, uproot and do away with all slavery; especially when joined with these—"there is no respect of persons with God," "neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free"; when "men-stealers" and "murderers" are in the same category; and "Babylon, the mother of harlots and abominations," making merchandise of "slaves and souls of men" (Rev. xviii: 13), *fell*, being judged of God? Add to these the idea of neighbor, and the common brotherhood of all, so plainly taught in the Gospel, and the result is conclusive. Take the principles of New Testament revelation, as an objective fact, and view them in the clear light of developed Scripture truth

— of subjective revelation, ever advancing in clearness, and what whisper of the Spirit of Revelation, what word, what letter, speaks in favor of slavery, or involuntary servitude of any kind, in any degree?

But, it is said, "Paul returned Onesimus to Philemon." Grant it, but how? "*Not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh, and in the Lord! If thou count me, therefore, as a partner, receive him as myself*" (Phil. 16, 17). Granting that Onesimus was a slave: granting that Philemon was his master: granting that Paul, knowing this, sent him back; yet the way, the spirit in which he sent him back — the manner in which he was to be received — the conditions of the case, put an end at once and for ever to the condition of service in which he before was, whatever that might be. Philemon was to receive him as a "beloved brother" — even as Paul himself. Would to God that every fugitive slave in *our land* could be so sent back — so received as was Onesimus: "Not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved — a Christian welcoming a Christian as a brother in Christ, his fellow and equal. This simple epistle of Paul to Philemon, in its proper, practical application, would subvert and put an end to the whole system of slavery, at least so far as professedly Christian masters are concerned. The principles of New Testament revelation, like those of the Old, in their proper and natural development — in their subjective revelation, steadily and surely subverted the very foundations of all slavery or involuntary servitude. That they did so work the subversion of the very ground principles of Roman slavery, not only so far as Christians were the masters, but even farther, to its final overthrow, is a matter of history. Not that Christianity was the *only* subverting element, but ever a strong aggressive element, threatening slavery's very existence. The principles and teachings of the Bible, in their clearly advancing development — in their subjective revelation, are ever tending to this end. "If the Son, therefore, shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed," (John viii: 36) — spiritually free — politically free—from ser-

itude to man — free *from* the service of Satan—free *to* serve God.

There may be obstacles, but they will be overcome. There may be opposition, but it will be vain. Truth and right and God will ultimately prevail. With whatever of truth, therefore, it may be asserted that the Bible, in the infancy of revelation, both as an objective fact, and as a subjective reality, in the earlier stages of the elevation of the race, tolerated systems of servitude, it is nevertheless true, that by no fair principles of interpretation — by no true conception of its teachings — by no adequate knowledge of the advance the subjective revelation has made towards the real *objective*, can slavery be sustained or defended by Bible teachings. The two are antagonistic, and where one holds, the other must in due time yield. Bible teachings — Christianity — Christ's religion, and slavery cannot permanently dwell together, either in the same heart, or in the same community, or in the same nation. The Bible will not countenance slavery; nor will slavery countenance the Bible. Thus, granting every thing that can, with any shadow of consistency be claimed, and more than can be *proved* to have existed, still the Bible triumphantly frees itself from all connivance at, from all sympathy with, from all support of, the system of slavery. The system stands out in all its hideous deformity, opposed alike by the facts of history and the truths of revelation.

ART. V.—CAREY AND HIS COADJUTORS.

BY REV. WARREN RANDOLPH, GERMANTOWN, PA.

The Life and Times of CAREY, MARSHMAN, and WARD, embracing the History of the Serampore Mission. By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. In two Volumes. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longman & Roberts. 1859. pp. 1038.

THESE volumes embody facts never before so clearly stated, and are written with an admiration and affection that never flag. They record the lives and labors of three men who awakened a spirit and started a train of influences, and superintended a system of agencies by which hundreds of millions of the human race have been enlightened and blest. Each of the three possessed a marked individuality, but their characters and influence were so beautifully blended that to contemplate one is to take in the group. There was no strife for preëminence among them, yet we instinctively feel that Carey was the central figure. He was the pioneer, and to the last remained the master, moving mind of the trio.

Carey's birthplace was the little village of Pury, North Hampshire, England. It was only the humble home of the parish clerk and village schoolmaster that was gladdened by his coming on the 17th of August, 1751, but it was decreed that before the ending of his career he should waken joy upon another continent, and be foremost in building up a kingdom that will last and flourish when the empire reared by London merchants upon the coasts of India shall have crumbled and perished.

At an early age Carey's intellectual vigor became apparent. When a child of six years, he solved problems in mental arith-

metic. He manifested an avidity for books of science, history and travels. He crowded his room with insects that he might mark their development. He studied drawing to assist his researches. In every walk he observed the hedges, collected flowers, and minutely examined the structure of plants.

The poverty of his parents, however, caused him to be early thrown upon his own resources. Although, in after-life, he was remarkably robust, a scorbutic disease unfitted him, when a boy, for out-door labor. At the age of fourteen, he was, therefore, apprenticed to a shoemaker. Most lads, in such circumstances, would have allowed their minds to run to waste. It was not so with William Carey.

There were a few books in the shop, and among them a Commentary upon the New Testament, with Greek words scattered through it. He did not even know the names of the Greek letters, but he copied, in a rude way, the characters with which he thus met. In his native village was a journeyman weaver by the name of Tom Jones, who had seen better days, and had enjoyed the advantages of a liberal education. When young Carey visited his father, he took his copy of Greek words to Jones, and obtained from him a translation.

His apprenticeship was terminated in two years, by the death of his master. After this he labored some three or four years as a journeyman, during which time he came under the influence, and enjoyed the friendship of the Rev. Thomas Scott, the well-known Scripture commentator. Mr. Scott became warmly attached to him. In after years, when he had occasion to pass the little shop in which Carey had worked, he would remark, "That was Mr. Carey's college."

Carey's relatives were all identified with the established church. Until he appeared, there was no dissenter among them. By the force of circumstances and the convictions of conscience, he was led to connect himself with the Baptists.

At the age of eighteen, he began his public ministrations. For three and a half years he preached to a small company of disciples at the village of Barton. Once a month he also preached in his native village. It was during these ministrations that his views were changed in regard to the mode and

subject of baptism. He was immersed by Dr. John Ryland, on the fifth of October, 1783, being at the time a little over twenty-two years of age.

Soon after this, a church was organized at Barton, and he was invited to become pastor. It was difficult for him to obtain ordination. Doubts were expressed as to whether he had sufficient ability to be a useful minister. His trial discourse he himself afterwards described as being "as crude and weak as anything could be, which is called or has been called a sermon." At length, however, he was ordained.

Before he had reached his twentieth year, he had married the sister of his employer. This marriage was exceedingly unfortunate. His wife was illiterate, and had no sympathy with his feelings and aspirations. She was in every way a most unsuitable companion, and yet he always treated her with the utmost tenderness and affection. As we proceed, we shall see how this early and hasty marriage fettered and distressed him.

The Hackleton shoemaker was now an ordained preacher. He prosecuted with energy his trade and his ministry. He divided his time between his bench, his books and his garden. He aspired to increased usefulness. The circle of his studies was enlarged as he could obtain the loan of books from his neighbors, or manage to increase the number of his own. To improve his acquaintance with languages, he read the Scriptures at his morning devotions in Hebrew, Greek and Latin.

But poverty cramped and almost crushed him. Trade became dull. In fact, he was never fitted for it. He was a man of wonderful capacity, but he had no capacity for managing secular concerns. Every attempt of his life, from the management of a shoe-shop to that of an indigo factory, proved a failure. No one was more sensible of this than he was himself. Thirty years later in life, when he was dining one day with the Governor-General of India, he overheard one of the guests ask another,—if Dr. Carey had not once been a shoemaker? Stepping instantly forward himself, he answered, "No, sir, only a cobbler."

The little congregation at Barton could not raise money

enough to clothe him. He was reduced almost to starvation. At length he removed to Moulton, where he divided his time between preaching and teaching. He was just about as well fitted for a schoolmaster as he was for a shoe-trader. He had ability to teach, but no power to control. In afterwards alluding to this period, he said: "It was the boys who kept me." His school was a failure, and he was compelled to return once more to the bench that he might obtain bread.

Notwithstanding the trials of his Moulton pastorate, it was of immense advantage to him. Here he was enabled to cultivate his acquaintance with Dr. Ryland. Here he enjoyed familiar intercourse with Robert Hall, Sen. — a man less famous than his eloquent son, but undoubtedly more valuable as a counsellor and companion. It was during his residence in this village that the intimacy sprang up between him and Andrew Fuller, which has linked their names together, and has stamped them both in letters of living light upon the cause of missions, of humanity, and of God. It was while instructing his Moulton pupils in geography that he was led to contemplate the condition of the heathen, and to form the design of carrying the gospel to them. It was at this time, also, that he proposed as a subject for discussion in a minister's meeting, "The duty of Christians to attempt the spread of the gospel among heathen nations," when Mr. Ryland, the father of his friend Dr. John Ryland, exclaimed: "Sit down, young man. When God pleases to convert the heathen, he will do it, without your aid or mine." But there were some present whose sympathies were in unison with Carey's, who were at once startled by the boldness of the proposition, and charmed with its sublimity.

At the age of twenty-eight, Mr. Carey removed to Leicester, where he was pastor of the church in which Robert Hall afterwards preached with such wonderful power. His efforts in behalf of missions, after more than four years' struggle, now began to be successful. Preaching before an Association at Nottingham, in May, 1792, he discussed these two propositions, now so familiar to the whole Christian world: "Expect great things from God; Attempt great things for God." The

effect of this discourse was thrilling. Dr. Ryland remarked, he should not have wondered if the people "had lifted up their voices, and wept."

In October of that year, a Missionary Society was formed at Kettering, by twelve ministers who had there met with Andrew Fuller. Never did men proceed with greater caution in a new undertaking. They continued in a long and anxious discussion in regard to the practicability of the enterprise. As fast as objections were presented Mr. Carey answered them, till finally they pledged themselves to God and to each other to make the attempt. A committee of management was chosen, and a subscription made of £13 2s. 6d. Mr. Carey instantly offered to go as a missionary.

It is important for a moment to consider what was the moral condition of the world, and to inquire how this new movement was regarded.

The continent of Europe was, at the time, convulsed with all the horrors of the French Revolution. The Papacy had just lost one of its brightest jewels, and the Goddess of Reason was adored instead of the cross. France had not only renounced her religion, proclaiming the Bible a cheat and death an eternal sleep, but was scattering her infidel and atheistic principles, and stretching out her hands to blight and curse the world. America was just beginning to recover from the effects of her seven years' war. Crippled in her resources, she required all her energies for her own recuperation. Africa was then, still more than it is to-day, a vast continent unknown — apparently shunned and hated of men, and forsaken of God. Asia, containing more than half the population of the globe, was almost a world by itself. Commerce had opened a communication with the southern part of the continent, and from the character of the natives there found, a very fair estimate was formed of those dwelling in the interior. They presented a strange contrast of intelligence and ignorance. They dwelt in a land of almost exhaustless resources, which they had neither the tact nor the energy to develop. They were the victims of absurd delusions, and practised the most horrid and

cruel rites. Though they numbered their deities by hundreds of millions, they were, in the Christian sense, literally without God and without hope. If they did not look upon Nigban, or Annihilation, as the state of supreme felicity, their ambition was satisfied with the hope of transmigration at their death into a beast or a bird. In the islands of the sea, the state of things was more revolting still. There was there no check to cruel deeds and horrid rites. Slaughtered natives were eaten as greedily as if they had been oxen.

Was it strange that Carey wept over this condition of human guilt and human woe? Was it strange that he called upon his brethren to lift up the standard of the Lord? As he led the way, however, were they ready to rally round him, and to cheer him?

Carey was the pioneer of modern missions. Noble, kindred spirits had lived before him. Eliot and Mayhew and Brainerd had labored to evangelize the savages of America. Schwartz and Kiernander had preached the gospel along the coast of Tranquebar. The Danes and Moravians had penetrated Greenland and Labrador; had planted missions at the Cape of Good Hope; in South America and the West Indies. These missionaries, however, directed their efforts chiefly to those who knew something of the true God. They did not, to any great extent, grapple with an organized and an ancestral heathenism. In that work Carey took the lead. About the time the Missionary Society was formed at Kettering, Mr. Charles Grant, a high-toned Christian gentleman residing in India, tried to induce Parliament to establish an Episcopal mission at Calcutta. The effort failed. More than a quarter of a century later, Mr. Grant remarked: "Many years ago I had formed the design of a mission to Bengal, and used my humble endeavors to promote the design. Providence reserved that honor for the Baptists." Two or three years after the Baptist Society was formed, the London Missionary Society, consisting of Low Churchmen and Dissenters, was organized, the torch of which, one of the founders gracefully acknowledged, "was lighted at the missionary altar which the Baptists had raised."

But the noble men who raised that altar, suffered no little obloquy. Only one Baptist minister in London favored the undertaking. The churches of the metropolis looked with distrust upon this movement of their obscure country brethren. "There was little or no respectability among us," Andrew Fuller afterwards wrote, "not so much as a squire to sit in the chair, or an orator to address him with speeches." The only warm sympathizer whom Mr. Carey found among the ministers in London, was that good old man of the Established Church, John Newton, who "advised him with the fidelity and tenderness of a father."

Men of every Christian name looked upon the scheme as chimerical. When a missionary organization was proposed among the Presbyterians of Scotland, three years after this movement of the Baptists, it was regarded as unnatural and revolutionary. A member of the General Assembly urged that to spread a knowledge of the gospel among barbarous and heathen nations was highly preposterous, as it anticipates, nay reverses, the order of nature. "Men must be polished and refined in their manners," he affirmed, "before they can be properly enlightened in religious truth." He went so far as to affirm that Christianity would neither refine the morals, nor insure the happiness of the Indian or the Otaheitan.

When the proposal to establish an Indian Mission was being discussed in the House of Lords in 1793, the Bishops, as a body, did not favor it. The Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London gave it a partial support, but the Bishop of St. David's "questioned the right of any people to send their religion to any other nation."

The providence of God, however, was raising up a class of men to rouse the energies of a sleeping church, and put to shame a sneering world. Providence determined, also, the sphere in which they were to operate.

When Mr. Carey offered his services as a missionary, he expressed a willingness to go to any field which the Society might designate. Just then Dr. John Thomas, a good, but singular and erratic man, arrived in England from Calcutta. Some time previously he had gone to Bengal as a surgeon in

the British service. The ignorance and degradation which he saw among the heathen had led him to attempt missionary work among them. Owing to defects in his character, however, he never attained a high degree of usefulness. Still he longed for the salvation of the heathen. Upon returning to England in 1792, he found kindred spirits in the Missionary Board at Kettering. He addressed them by letter. He spread out before them the wants and woes of India. He besought them to send their missionary to that land whose golden harvest seemed already bending for the sickle of the reaper. At length, he went in person to meet these missionary brethren. When he entered the room where they were sitting, Mr. Carey sprang from his seat, and they fell upon each other's neck, and wept. The determination was soon reached that Mr. Carey and Dr. Thomas should together attempt the establishment of a mission in Bengal.

Bengal was then, as it continues to be, the most important division of British India. The British power in the East was of gradual development. For more than three hundred years European merchants have been acquiring fortunes in India, through the medium of chartered trading companies. These companies have been established successively by the Portuguese, the Dutch, the English, the French, the Danes, and the Swedes. The English East India Company took its rise in 1613, and now, after two hundred and fifty years, it has absorbed all the others, and has become the most potent corporation in the world. From 1748 it was invested with political power, but was itself subordinate to the British Crown.

Around Calcutta, the capital of the Bengal Presidency, there was, in 1792, an immense European population. It was composed chiefly of adventurers destitute of character or principle. A few maintained the form of religion, but the vast majority were viler than the heathen. Avarice and licentiousness appeared to have the mastery over every virtue. Thus "for a century and a quarter, Calcutta presented such a scene of unblushing shame as had never been witnessed before under the British flag. England had subdued Bengal and Bengal had subdued the morals of her conquerors." It

was to a heathen nation, surrounded by such influences as these, that Carey and Thomas were appointed to go.

A new difficulty now arose. Mrs. Carey positively refused to accompany her husband. Every appeal and entreaty failed to change her determination. Painful as such an arrangement was, it was finally agreed that Mr. Carey should proceed without her, but with the hope that when he was established she would join him.

Another obstacle was immediately encountered. The East India Company was hostile to missionary work. They refused the Missionaries a passage upon any of their ships, or a license to enter their dominions. A captain in their service agreed, however, to evade this order from Leadenhall street, and to touch at the Isle of Wight as he was outward bound, and there take Carey and Thomas on board. This pious strategy almost succeeded, but unfortunately there had been spies about, who revealed the plan to the very men who ought not to have known it. While the baggage of the Missionaries was being hastily conveyed to the ship, an order came from London that no passenger must be allowed on board who had not been furnished with a license by the Company. The hopes that were at blood-heat instantly went down to zero.

And yet it was a favoring providence. Mr. Carey obtained another interview with his wife, and gained her consent to accompany him. About the middle of June, 1793, this company of British Missionaries sailed for India on board a merchantman from Denmark.

Upon reaching Calcutta, they took up their residence in the city. Their scanty funds were soon exhausted, through the recklessness of Dr. Thomas. This gentleman was overwhelmingly in debt when Mr. Carey first met him. He now resumed the practice of his profession in Calcutta, leaving Mr. Carey to provide for himself. The lonely Missionary was reduced to great extremities, and was finally sheltered by a rude hovel, which a benevolent native offered him in the outskirts of the city.

Soon after this he removed to the most wretched home he had ever occupied. It was in the Soonderbuns, below Calcutta. "The Soonderbuns consist of a vast tract of jungle facing the

Bay of Bengal, and covering an area of more than six thousand five hundred square miles. This region was formerly filled with hamlets and towns and a rich cultivation," but it had fallen into decay, and "was now a dense and deadly forest, inhabited by wild beasts." Woodcutters occasionally resorted to it, and here and there was a clearing, with a little village gathered round a manufactory of salt. "In this region of jungle and tigers and miasma, apart from all civilized and Christian associations," Mr. Carey built his huts and attempted to plant his mission.

But the Providence of God was preparing for him a new sphere of operation. Mr. George Udney, a Christian gentleman who was engaged in the manufacture of indigo, was in want of two persons to superintend his factories. He proffered one place to Dr. Thomas, who obtained the other for his friend then staying in the Soonderbuns. In this new occupation, which saved him both from starvation and from the tiger, Carey did not succeed much better than in making shoes. For five years, however, he continued in it, all the while preaching the Gospel, acquiring a knowledge of the language, and devoting one fourth of his income to missionary objects.

In 1799 four new Missionaries sailed from England. These were Marshman and Ward, Grant and Brunson. The two latter died comparatively young. Marshman and Ward were associated with Carey till the world came to look upon the three as moral heroes.

These new Missionaries, who had been obliged to go to India in an American ship, were not allowed, on reaching Calcutta, to remain in the city. They immediately fixed their residence in Serampore, a little Danish town upon the Ganges, sixteen miles above the British capital. Here they could enjoy a protection under the Danish flag which would not be given at that time to Christian missionaries under the flag of Britain. Mr. Carey soon joined them. On the 10th of January he removed from the indigo factory to Serampore, with his family, consisting of four sons, and a wife then in a state of hopeless insanity.

The Missionaries bought a plat of ground, and began at once the vigorous prosecution of their work. They lived as one family, and made common stock of their resources. Mr. Ward set up a printing press, and proceeded to issue the Bengalee translation of the Bible, the whole of which, except two books of the Old Testament, Mr. Carey had already completed. Mr. and Mrs. Marshman opened two boarding schools to assist in supporting the establishment. The study of the language was prosecuted with great diligence, while portions of each morning and afternoon were spent in preaching the Gospel.

Late in the autumn, Dr. Thomas came down from his indigo factory, bringing with him a native named Fukeer, who professed conversion. It was like water to the thirsty soul. More than seven years had now passed since Mr. Carey left England, and this was the first fruit among the heathen. No tongue or pen can describe the emotion which was awakened. "We all stood up," writes Mr. Ward, "and sang with new feelings, 'Praise God from whom all blessings flow.' Each brother took Fukeer by the hand. The rest your imagination must supply." But they were doomed to a cruel disappointment. After Fukeer had been received as a candidate for baptism, he went to visit his friends, and was never heard from again.

A blessing, however, was at hand. On the day that Fukeer caused so much joy, Dr. Thomas was called to set a dislocated arm for a native. After the operation, Dr. Thomas began to preach the Gospel to him; for, notwithstanding the defects in his character, the Dr. always retained his interest in missionary work, and was ever ready to labor for the good of the heathen. His patient not only listened attentively, but soon came to inquire further concerning the doctrine, and in a little while gave evidence of conversion. The Missionaries began to prepare for his baptism. The waters of the Ganges, along which such horrid scenes had been enacted, were to be employed in the sacred rite. It was a joyous day at the Mission House. With what emotions the heart of every Missionary must have thrilled! It was more than poor Thomas could endure. For seventeen

years he had been laboring, more or less constantly, for the conversion of the heathen, and now as he saw this first realization of his hopes, his mind lost its balance and he became insane. He at length grew so violent that it was necessary to confine him.

On the last Sunday morning in December, 1800, the ordinance of baptism was administered. Such a scene never occurred before in the history of the world. The Missionaries and their friends walked in procession from the chapel to the river. Mr. Carey led the way, accompanied by two candidates for baptism, his oldest son and Krishnu Pal, the convert from heathenism. "Mr. Thomas, who was confined to his couch, made the air resound with his blasphemous ravings, and Mrs. Carey, shut up in her own room on the opposite side of the path, poured forth the most painful shrieks." The Danish Governor, a large body of Portuguese and other Europeans, and a dense crowd of Hindoos and Mahomedans, were waiting at the river to witness the novel ceremony. The motley crowd was awed to perfect silence by the impressive scene, and the Governor was melted to tears. In the afternoon the Lord's Supper was administered for the first time in the Bengalee language.

In reviewing these events Rev. Andrew Fuller wrote the Missionaries, "You were anxious to settle up the country; God impelled you to settle where you are," adding, in reference to Mr. Marshman's journal, "O blessed for ever be the Lord, and blessed be you. To say, Give my love to Brother Marshman, is feeble. If I could send my soul over in a letter, it would come and mingle with your souls, with your labors, with your joys and your sorrows."

It was a high and noble purpose which led these men to India. "A sublimer thought," said Mr. Wilberforce, "cannot be conceived than when a poor cobbler formed the resolution to give to the millions of Hindoos the Bible in their own language." With the loftiest purpose they joined the most humble and unpretending methods. They used the simplest forms of devotion, while the representatives of the English Establishment at Calcutta, upon a day of general thanksgiving,

sung the Te Deum in the church, and fired a royal salute from the fort and the shipping, to show that the Christian religion was the religion of the state! When the Bishopric of Calcutta was established in 1813, it was ordered that the Bishop should rank above the military chieftain, though the latter was to be saluted with two more guns than the former. The Governor's salute was seventeen guns, and the Bishop's fifteen! Imagine the prelate in flowing robes greeted by the roar of fifteen cannon, then turn to the humble men who stand in the market place or by the way side preaching Jesus to the heathen, and which seems most apostolic? If the Serampore establishment assumed a degree of magnificence in after years, it was the magnificence of grand results. The Missionaries remained the same self-denying and consecrated men to the last.

While the boldness of Carey's faith aroused the energies of a large part of the Christian world, there were not a few who treated the whole subject with scorn or derision. The bitterest assault, perhaps, was that made in the *Edinburgh Review*. Ashamed of the tone and temper of these articles, the editor of that magazine, twenty years after, attempted to shield himself from the dishonor of their publication, by declaring the fact that they were written by a clergyman. They came from the pen of Sydney Smith, who bore the name of a preacher, but who was a much better joker. Mr. Smith thought, or pretended to think, you might as well throw soft peas against a rock, as to send missionaries to India, with the hope of making any impressions upon the millions in that land. He tried to grow witty over an attempt to convert the heathen by "a few consecrated cobblers," who were to rely upon a treasury containing thirteen pounds two shillings and sixpence.

In 1813 the charter of the East India Company was to be renewed. The friends of Missions now hoped to secure a legal toleration. Their cause was placed in the hands of Mr. Wilberforce, who threw into it all the earnestness which characterized his sublime efforts to abolish the slave trade. He spoke in the House of Commons in behalf of the Missionary cause for three hours, with an eloquence and power which he

had never surpassed. He paid a splendid compliment to the Serampore Missionaries, and remarked concerning them: "I can only admire that eminence of merit which I despair myself to reach, and bow before such exalted virtue."

Very different, however, was the language of others. One member of the House doubted whether the time had come for "every inspired cobbler or fanatical tailor who felt an inward call," to attempt, with a kind of apostolic right, the conversion of the Hindoos. He was startled and horrified at the miseries likely to be produced by what he called "the glorious object of making sixty millions of men Baptists or Anabaptists." Referring to the system of caste, which Christianity would attempt to overthrow, he inquired, "Are the missionaries whom this bill will let loose upon India fit engines for this great revolution?" "Will the people," crawling from the holes and caverns of their original destinations, apostates from the loom and anvil—and renegades from the lowest handicraft employments, be a match for the cool and sedate controversies they will have to encounter?" He then indulged in a magnificent eulogy of Hindoo institutions and practices. He dwelt with peculiar force upon the abstinence from intoxicating liquors which the Shasters enjoined, and which, he said, would be everthrown by the introduction of Christianity. "In exchange for this virtue," he added, "they will have been initiated into the mysteries of election and reprobation. I leave it," he continued, "to those who are versed in moral calculations to decide what will have been gained to ourselves, by giving them Calvinism and fermented liquors, and whether predestination and gin will be a compensation to the natives of India for the changes which will overwhelm their habits, morals and religion." While the prejudice of the Hindoos was so great as to prevent their buying foreign woollens, he was astonished that any person should suppose them "prepared to receive the coarsest texture of theology that could be dealt out from the shops of the Anabaptists, or woven in the loom of their fevered and fanatical fancies."

This last sentence hinted at the real cause of opposition. British woollens and India goods lay at the foundation of it

all. To enrich themselves, the East India Company and their abettors sought to keep sixty millions of people ignorant and degraded. For the sake of gain, they were even willing to show deference to heathen rites and practices. Twenty years before this they had announced their readiness to build a temple for idolatrous worship on the banks of the Ganges. In fact the British government eventually became the patron of the Hindoo and Mahomedan religions. A governmental officer was appointed to superintend the repairs of temples and mosques, while all qualms of conscience were quieted by the pilgrim tax, paid at these idolatrous shrines, to the government, and which amounted, at one time, to thirty-eight thousand pounds a year.

Nothing was dreaded by the men who were engaged in these deeds of darkness, so much as the light of Christian truth. One of the Directors of the East India Company is reported to have said, that he would rather see a band of devils in India, than a band of missionaries. The opposition was so great that no less than nine missionaries, who went to India between 1802 and 1812, were obliged to come to this country and take passage in American ships. But a brighter day was dawning. The charter of 1813 gave protection to the men who were striving to elevate and enlighten a prostrate and benighted race.

More entire devotion to the work of doing good has seldom been seen, than was illustrated in Carey and his coadjutors. Others have endured greater privation, have suffered fiercer persecution ; but few have shown themselves so utterly unselfish. Though immense fortunes were within their grasp, they steadily refused to accumulate for themselves. The great business of their lives was preaching the gospel and translating the Bible. Their labors in addition were almost incredible. Mr. Ward conducted a printing establishment, in which he had in operation no less than nineteen printing presses. Mr. Marshman was at the head of an exceedingly popular and lucrative school ; and Mr. Carey, who was one of the most remarkable linguists of the age, was an Instructor in the military college at Calcutta. While engaged in these remu-

nerative labors, they practiced the most rigid economy in their domestic expenses, and, after making small remittances to a few indigent relatives in England, they devoted their whole income to the Mission. For the last thirty or thirty-five years of their lives, they did not expend for themselves a farthing raised in England. The property which they bought they vested in the Missionary Society, and only retained control of it themselves as trustees.

Dr. Carey had been in India twenty-four years before the Missionaries made any provision for their families. They then set apart for their children one-tenth of their income. In other respects, the arrangement into which they entered at the outset was scrupulously carried out to the last. Carey, Marshman and Ward all died poor, but the aggregate of their benevolent contributions, during their missionary life, was eighty thousand pounds sterling, or nearly four hundred thousand dollars.

At the very time, however, when they were making these sacrifices, they were the subjects of most ungenerous criticism. When Mr. Cary undertook the management of the indigo factory at Mudnabatty, a communication was sent to him from England, in which he was upbraided for "allowing the spirit of the Missionary to be swallowed up in the pursuits of the Merchant." His sublime reply to the men who had left him to starve upon a foreign shore, was, "I can only say, that after my family's obtaining a bare allowance, my whole income goes for the purposes of the Gospel. . . . I am indeed poor, and shall be always so until the Bible is published in Bengalee and Hindoostanee, and the people want no further instruction."

In one of her letters, Mrs. Ward incidentally mentioned the price she had been obliged to pay for a bonnet. Whatever the cost was, it came out of an allowance of forty shillings a month, with which Mr. and Mrs. Ward covered all their personal expenses. Grave men, however, discussed the purchase, and reached the deliberate conclusion that the hat cost too much, and that the Missionary's wife was extravagant.

A few years after this, Mrs. Marshman visited England, where she was subject to the most impertinent inquiries. Her husband had founded the largest educational establishment in India, in which were gathered the children of the most eminent men in the empire. The Missionaries had deemed it wise to make provision for the suitable entertainment of these patrons of the school, who came frequently to visit it. But the most absurd rumors had gone abroad in regard to the expensiveness of the establishment. When Mrs. Marshman was in London, she was invited to tea with the editor of the Baptist Magazine, who inquired particularly about the number of silver spoons and articles of plate used at Serampore, as he said, "for the good of the cause;" and as the facts were much more favorable than he feared, he assured her he should give them a wide circulation!

After the death of Mr. Ward, complaint was made that Drs. Carey and Marshman granted too liberal an allowance for Mrs. Ward's support. This aroused the indignation of Dr. Marshman, who asked, whether it could be supposed that the widow of their colleague, bound to them by twenty years of united labor, would be allowed to want? "She shall have enough for her comfort," he added, "if we have only bread for ourselves."

The Serampore Missionaries exerted all their energies to develop the moral, intellectual and material interests of the Hindoos. When they entered the country, mothers were sacrificing their children to Juggernaut and the Ganges, and wives were immolating themselves upon the funeral piles of their husbands. It was not until twenty-seven years after Dr. Carey first addressed the Governor-General of India upon the subject, that suttees, or wife-burnings, were prohibited by law. The Act of abolition was passed on the 4th of December, 1829. Dr. Carey was requested to translate it, that it might be published in Bengalee and English at the same time. It was Saturday evening when the document reached him. Knowing that a day's delay would cost the lives of at least two victims, instead of entering his pulpit on the Sabbath morning, he sat down to the translation of the edict, and be-

fore night he had completed it. "In five years suttees became matters of history ; and in less than twenty years it was affirmed by natives, jealous of their national honor, that they never could have existed."

Carey and his associates exerted all their influence to break up the system of caste. They were the first to point out to the Hindoos its inherent baseness. They showed its antagonism to the spirit of the Gospel, and insisted upon its absolute exclusion from the native Christian church.

Their attention was early directed to a numerous class of wretched children in Calcutta, many of whom were the illegitimate offspring of European fathers and Indian mothers. They established a "Benevolent Institution," where many hundreds of these children were gathered and gratuitously educated.

At Serampore the Missionaries set up the first steam-engine which the natives ever saw. They made the first maps, and printed the first books ever issued in the native language. They published the first newspaper, and established the first religious periodical ever known in India. They originated an Agricultural Society, which now embraces hundreds of members in Europe and Asia, and which has been, during the last forty years, a vigorous and successful agent of improvement.

Dr. Carey had a passion for flowers. Just after his marriage he hired a neat little cottage at Hackleton, which was chiefly desirable on account of the garden attached to it; and the garden was cultivated with such assiduity that it flourished far better than his shoe trade. While he was at the Indigo factory, two years after his arrival in Hindostan, he sent to England for "scythes and sickles and ploughs, with a supply of seeds for the garden and for flowers." Soon after the settlement at Serampore, a large plat of ground, in the rear of the Mission House, was assigned to him for a botanical garden. It covered five acres, and was stocked with plants from all quarters of the globe. In this garden Dr. Carey passed some of his happiest hours. He rose at four in the morning, to walk among his plants. This was his favorite resort for

devout meditation. His fondness for flowers did not diminish as he grew old. During his last sickness he made frequent inquiries concerning them. One day he exclaimed with great emotion, "After I am gone, Brother Marshman will turn the cows into the garden!" "Far be it from me," replied his aged colleague; "though I have not your botanical tastes, I shall consider the preservation of the garden, in which you have taken so much delight, a sacred duty."

One of the most splendid undertakings at Serampore was the founding of a college. It was the first institution established in a heathen land for the training of a native Christian ministry. The Missionaries expended of their own funds more than fifteen thousand pounds upon the building. In the United States ten thousand dollars were raised toward the endowment. After the death of the men who had founded the college, its doors were for a time closed, and the undertaking was regarded as a failure. It has, however, been reopened, and the institution is now in successful operation.

Mr. Ward compiled a large and valuable work on the History, Literature and Religion of the Hindoos. Dr. Marshman translated the Scriptures into Chinese, and published a treatise on the structure of the Chinese language. Dr. Carey gave himself to the making of Dictionaries, Grammars, and Bible Translations. His Bengalee Dictionary, in three quarto volumes, cost immense labor, and was a work of great value. But a desire to give the Bible to every tribe in the East was the ruling passion of his life. As soon as he had completed it in one dialect, he commenced it in another. The achievements of himself and his colleagues were astounding. As early as 1809 Southey wrote an article for the *Quarterly Review*, in which he said, using the contemptuous epithets of the day, "These low-born and low-bred mechanics have translated the whole Bible into Bengalee, and have by this time printed it. They are printing the New Testament in the Sanscrit, the Orissa, the Mahratta, the Hindoostanee and the Guzera-tee. They are translating it into Persic, Telinga, Carnata, Chinese, the language of the Sikhs and of the Burmans. . . .

. . . . In fourteen years these low-born, low-bred mechanics

have done more towards spreading a knowledge of the Scriptures among the heathen, than has been accomplished, or even attempted by all the world besides." The aggregate of their labors in this department was the translation and printing of the Bible, in whole or in part, into more than thirty oriental languages and dialects.

The labors of these Missionaries were pursued amid many trials. For twenty years they had to contend with the opposition of the government. For twelve years Dr. Carey had an insane wife, who was often raving in the next room but one to that in which he was writing and translating. Once a fire swept over a part of the Mission premises, destroying in a night property valued at seven thousand pounds.

But their greatest trial was a misunderstanding between themselves and the Society in England. They were sent to India to organize a mission which should be, at the earliest possible day, self-sustaining. This object was speedily accomplished. They then claimed that a mission which was entirely self-supporting should be self-directing. At this point the Managers of the Society took issue with them. The unpleasant controversy was continued for ten years, when it resulted in a separation between the Society and the Missionaries, in 1827. For the next ten years the Serampore Mission was conducted upon an independent basis. At the end of that time Dr. Marshman was the only survivor of the original trio. He was infirm, and the mission was in debt. A proposal was made in 1837 to reunite it with the old Society. Former differences were adjusted, and the union effected in London—as it subsequently appeared—the next day after Dr. Marshman was buried in Serampore.

These three men seem to have been born to act together. There was just enough difference in the structure of their minds to fit them for their diversified work. Ward possessed the finest personal appearance, and was, probably, the most accomplished gentleman. His disposition was peculiarly amiable and affectionate. Marshman was tall in person and affable in manner. He was ardent, buoyant, and sometimes apparently obstinate. Carey's stature was not above the medium

height, and his figure was of a plebeian cast. He was child-like in simplicity, firm in decision, constant and untiring in toil. Fervent piety was the crowning excellence of each. Differing in temperament, and frequently in opinion, their mutual confidence and affection not only remained unshaken, but continued to grow stronger to the last.

Mr. Ward died in 1823, in the fifty-fourth year of his age. Dr. Carey survived him eleven years, and was, at the time of his death, in 1834, almost seventy-three. The death of Dr. Marshman occurred in 1837, a little before he had reached his seventieth year. They all slumber together near the scene of their toils and their triumphs.

What touching memories cluster round the Serampore Mission! Its founders, who were ridiculed for undertaking such a work with thirteen pounds, lived to see the Christian world pour into mission treasuries four hundred thousand pounds, or nearly two million dollars, annually. They began their work amid the jeers of the unbelieving, but they lived to receive the plaudits of the most distinguished men of their time. In 1827 Dr. Marshman visited Great Britain, and in many places was received with a perfect ovation. The most marked attention was shown him by such persons as Robert Hall, John Foster, Hannah More, the poet Montgomery, Jeffery, the once sneering Editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, Sir Walter Scott and Dr. Chalmers. All intelligent men had now come to associate Serampore and its Missionaries with the welfare and elevation of the human race.

What sublime scenes were witnessed at Serampore! It was there that the first triumph of modern missions was gained among the heathen. It was there that Judson and Rice received Christian baptism, rising from their grave in the Ganges to arouse and thrill so large a part of the Christian world. What a privilege it must have been to share the friendship of the holy men who dwelt at Serampore! No wonder that Dr. Wilson, the Episcopal Bishop of Calcutta, should go, as he did, when Carey was dying, to ask his benediction.

The very spot is invested with a kind of sacredness. Although every thing is changed, there are touching memorials

on every hand. They tell of noble and heroic devotion, while every wind that sweeps around the old Mission premises, across the decayed flower garden, or through those college halls, seems to bear upon its wings the shout, "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined."

ART. VI.—PHASES OF AMERICAN LIBERAL THEOLOGY.

[BY REV. A. F. SPALDING, WARREN, R. I.]

- 1.—*The Works of William Ellery Channing. Eleventh Edition.* Boston. 1849.
- 2.—*Discourse on the Transient and Permanent in Christianity.* By THEODORE PARKER. Boston. 1841.
- 3.—*Re-statements of Christian Doctrine.* By HENRY W. BELLOWS. New York. 1861.

CULTURE and high social position are found among the advocates of American Liberal Theology. It has been nurtured in New England, and under the auspices of the oldest University of our land. It presents more names of note, in proportion to the entire number of its adherents, than are found in any church of our American Christendom. Men of genius, of moral worth, of great intellectual power, have here found a genial home, and some of them their fellow-citizens have called to high official positions.

The development and status of such a Theology are not singularities in the history of opinions. It represents an element which has ever existed in nominal Christianity, of which Pelagius, and others who preceded and followed him, were

exponents. Denying the innate depravity of man, denying also the belief, on man's part, of whatever may not be comprehensible by his reason, it is the elevation of the human, the supremacy of reason, the effort to bring down the divine to human standards.

The familiar works whose titles are placed at the head of this article, indicate the phases of Liberal Theology in America. The historical development of these, is all that this sketch aims to present.

Agitation is necessary to life and its true growth. True religion lived during centuries of papal rule, but it was concealed. Luther and the Reformation brought it to light. The Reformed Church of the Eighth Henry did not satisfy the Englishman. Religious thought, in its development, could not even thus be trammelled. Puritanism, simple freedom from form in the worship of God, satisfied him. He loved the Church of England, and hesitated to leave it, hoping that it would yet lay aside the prayer-book and the surplice. Entire liberty of thought, however, he had to learn, and to grant, in the new world, where he found a home. While every human system needs in its life some disturbing element to deepen its roots and increase its strength, the Puritanism of New England, for more than a century after the landing at Plymouth, was undisturbed by any great religious movement. So that the Puritans of the seventeenth century in New England had become no less Precisians, than were Queen Elizabeth and her Primate in the sixteenth century in England. Church and State were closely bound together. A so-called stern mysterious Calvinism, with here and there only an exception, held all minds beneath its sway.

The preaching of Edwards in America, and the almost simultaneous appearance of Whitefield and the Wesleys in both England and America, accomplished for evangelical religion what the Reformation had done for Christianity. The Anglican Church and Puritanism were alike at ease. And though the revival of the eighteenth century in New England was followed by a lamentable declension, and by the Half-way-Covenant, its work has not yet ceased. It

brought the forces of Christianity together, and infused into them new vitality. What was not real was at the same time repelled, and thus the way was paved for the formation of more liberal systems.

Added to this great work, another principle, operating as a producing cause of Liberalism in America, is found in the movements for civil liberty, with which the eighteenth century was filled. Man's entire being is affected by such agitation. Creeds are examined. Many rebel at their restrictions, and they are discarded. Those times of trial during the first seven decades of the last century, led to peace under a free government. The close of the revolution was favorable to general inquiry, and was followed by the forming of new opinions. The exciting objects of attention being removed, there was room for more freedom and breadth of religious thought. And the Half-way-Covenant had brought irreligion into the Church. Nominal religion, found in all churches and communities, was waiting an opportunity to break the fetters of Calvinism. Reason had long enough bowed to faith, and now aimed to assert her supremacy. Real or supposed dogmatism repels men from the prevailing views, or drives them into opposition. Rationalism, too, had begun its work in Germany, and its influences were crossing the ocean.

One of the natural results of producing causes like these, was the appearance, as a system, of a more liberal theology. Those nominal religionists who did not wish longer to fraternize too closely with real piety, were allowed by this system to retain its forms, without its vitality. This system gave to reason, as it sought the assumption of ultimate authority, more room for action. A theory was found, which, without much difficulty, would satisfy both reason and nominal religion. A view of man was presented, reproducing virtually that of Pelagius, denying the innate sinfulness of human nature, and the need of the atonement, and asserting the bias of the nature towards God, and man's ability, unaided, to do good works. But it was not by resting primarily, on the sinlessness of man, as an admitted basis, that American Liberal Theology took its first phase. If man's nature be holy at the

outset, and if the tendencies are to continued sinlessness, then, it is true, no Divine aid may be needed, and salvation may be in man's own power. But equally true is it, that if there be no Divine Saviour, then is such a view of man needed, as shall eliminate from his nature his entire depravity, and call for no all-sufficient atonement.

It was in announcing the Divine Unity, as excluding, from the nature of the case, the Godhead of Christ, that this Theology first appeared. Its followers asserted that the Deity of Christ was inexplicable, and abhorrent to human reason. With Socinus and Priestley, they dwelt on the inspired assertions of the Divine unity, without reference to their obvious employment in Scripture as the strongest dissuasives from the growth of those tendencies to idolatry, into which Egyptian influences in their captivity, and their surroundings, rendered the Jews so prone to fall. They paid no regard to those passages of Revelation which directly announce the deity of Christ. They taught that an atonement was needless. "We are saved," says Dr. Priestley, "on reformation of life, without any foreign consideration whatever." And connected with this was the belief, that the human mind was competent to sit as a moral and spiritual tribunal on a professed revelation. "We must start in religion from our own souls," says Channing. The holders of these views assumed the name of Unitarians. Early in the present century, under this name, they compelled their fellow-worshippers to withdraw from, while themselves retained possession of, sanctuaries whose walls, for nearly two centuries, had echoed to the great doctrines uttered by the Chaunceys, the Mayhews, the Thatchers and the Mathers. The adherents of Unitarianism took the control of Harvard University with its seal "*Christo et ecclesiæ*,"—a control held for fifty years, but now passing into other hands.

The sect gained strength rapidly under its first and great leader, Dr. Channing. If he was not possessed of so strong a logic as some of his followers, he was a man of clear perception, of great moral vigor and energy, of catholic spirit, of broad and philosophic views. With a heart as large as hu-

manity, and with deep reverence for all that is good, he was eminently fitted for leadership. Many followers gathered themselves beneath his standard. Abler champions in the pulpit than himself, masters in eloquence, and strong names in every professional department, joined the new ranks. The press teemed with pamphlets and sermons in the controversy which followed. "*Preservative against Unitarianism*," "*Letters against Trinitarianism*," "*Unitarianism incapable of Vindication*," "*Plain Questions to Calvinists*," and "*A Short method with the Unitarian nobility*," are the names of some of the articles and pamphlets which came after each other in these years of contest. The year 1815 was the marked period of the struggle, when the celebrated letters on American Unitarianism were written, by those able antagonists, Drs. Channing and Worcester. Channing's "*Moral Argument against Calvinism*" appeared in 1820. Since the death of Channing his colleague and successor as pastor has been prominent in the ranks, if not the leader, at least in the pulpit, of Old School Unitarianism.

For many years the growth of Unitarianism was rapid. A few men of prominence withdrew covertly from the old churches, and embraced the new theology. The defection of others was not so silent. Among the pamphlets of the year 1818 is one entitled, "*Reasons offered by Samuel Eddy, Esq., for his Opinions, to the First Baptist Church in Providence, R. I.*," from which he was compelled to withdraw for heterodoxy. In the city of its birth, Liberal Christianity took the lead in the number of its churches, and in the popularity, if not in the theological learning and ability, of its ministry. Buckminster and Everett have been surpassed by none in American pulpit eloquence.

But Unitarianism halted in its course. It did not long remain stationary, and for a quarter of a century it has waned. Having its strong foothold in Boston and vicinity, it has not there increased the number of its churches, and it has had not more than one or two bodies of worshippers in any of the great cities of the land, while the leading denominations of evangelical Christianity have had an unprecedented growth. Presenting in its ranks great moral worth, with little

absolute opinion, and a profound reverence for the Sabbath and religion, with a reverence still more profound for reason itself; a negative theology, pleasing to man's wishes, favorable to culture, freed from the restraints of an inflexible Calvinism, having its early development when the mind was expanding in every direction, why has it not grown? Bidding fair, under such auspices, to be a power in the earth, why has it retrograded?

It does not meet the wants of man's nature. There was a consciousness of guilt in Paradise, before the voice of the Lord God was heard calling for the guilty. This has been a consciousness common to all the race. Anterior to all systems of man, it was the unprejudiced expression of every heart: A holy law is broken by man's sinful nature. And underneath all human opinions, there is a deep, irrepressible longing for reconciliation to an offended God, of conscious unfitness for his presence, and of inability, unaided, to obtain his favor. That system is abnormal, then, which is based on the rectitude of human nature. It is abhorrent to man's convictions. He must school himself to its acceptance. Sacrifice also has been universal, and its meaning has ever been that of propitiation for sin. The vicarious sacrifice of Christ, perceived and accepted, satisfies. The conscience-stricken sinner can take up with no plan which makes Christ's death "nothing more than a testimony to the truth of what He taught for the benefit of man."

Unitarianism lacks vitality, and the aggressive element. It makes little invasion upon the ranks of sin, and wins few victories. Earnest hearts are among its members, who complain, at its annual and occasional gatherings, of its lack of life; while others welcome a negative religion, which demands the form without the spirit, which allows to the Christian hopes without that toil which, like a law of our being, is in all things an unalterable condition of success.

Definiteness is another principle of growth which Unitarianism lacks. It is indefinite as a system. Upon that one point in which it differs from all other names of christendom, it presents the most latitudinarian views, from Socinius's belief

that Christ was a mere man, up to that view which exalts Him above all other created beings, and yet leaves Him derived and dependent. In this very indefiniteness, Liberalism finds the absence of one principle upon which the continuance and growth of a system rest, and in this phase of it is admitted that which warred against itself, and led the way to its decline.

Of the small force on the broad field, the extreme right has sought affinity with the less stern aspects of Calvinism, while the extreme left, under an able leader, has found Rationalism itself unsatisfying. With no perceptible increase,—with forces reduced by desertions on either hand to Parkerism or to other armies in the church—gradually losing its foothold in its seat of learning, the religious element entering largely at this moment into the filling of its vacant Presidency,—with these elements of decay, we see little of hope in the future of Unitarianism. It may be the hereditary heir-loom of many families—it may live for years, and for centuries—but will it not be as a feeble name among religious sects?

American Liberal Theology in later years has presented itself in a new phase. A second controversial period has ensued, but the discussions have been in another direction.

Placing reason before Revelation, combating opinions strong in a growth of eighteen centuries, Unitarianism was nourishing in its own bosom those who not only could not remain at home there, but those whom, with its own views, it could not allow to remain there—whom Rationalism could not satisfy. These were not content with the aim of the Rationalists of the Tübingen School to harmonize “the Biblical history, and specially that contained in the Gospels, with the decrees of human reason and the dictates of universal experience, in fact, by explaining away the supernatural in it, to reduce it to the level of ordinary truth.” The views whose advent we now notice took a broader sweep, and went beyond ultra-rationalism.

Associated with the younger Ware as colleague during the early decay of Unitarianism, and afterwards sole pastor of a north-end Boston church, was Ralph Waldo Emerson. His connection with the church as pastor soon closed, from his wish

to make use of no elements in the administration of the Lord's supper. Beginning his dissent from Christianity with this independence of control in regard to set regulations of religious worship he has ended in Pantheism. In 1840, "*The Dial*," a magazine for literature, philosophy, and religion, appeared in Boston. Emerson was one of its original editors and chief supporters. It was transcendental and orphic in its sayings, and in its religious views sneered at the commonly received religious creeds. Emerson represents Philosophy as treating Religion with a patronizing air,—as not being opposed to faith, but as quite disposed to befriend it, and to help it soar higher. But throwing off his peculiar views on religious matters, from seeming pressure rather than of his own accord, or concealing them beneath elaborated prose and poetry, retiring and reticent, compelling others to think rather than thinking for them, loving the cloister rather than the forum, Emerson was no mover of the masses. He did not take hold of man.

The leader of this new phase in theology, and who gave to it its name, was one among the contributors to *The Dial*, and the author of many acute papers of a critical character in its pages. He was the minister of the second church in Roxbury. A living man, his heart beat with humanity. With a style simple, severe, and seldom adorned, yet, when he chose, using not common, but bold, striking, startling, not easily forgotten figures, excelling in clearness of thought, no one doubted for a moment what he meant. However bold and daring his assertions, he did not ask any one to study their hidden meaning. There was the utterance, and the shock was instantaneous. Of irreproachable life—taking broad and philanthropic views of men and things—with a keen eye to the wrong-doer, and a power of rebuke unsurpassed in his time, he held the inquiring spirit by no ordinary power. With some elegance of fancy, effective in satire, acute in analysis, "slow, didactic, and positive as a speaker," these prominent qualities prepared him to lead men.

Developing these powers while as yet they were unrecognized, it was as the pastor of a comparatively obscure suburban

parish that he sent forth thoughts and words which moved old England even more profoundly than new England, bringing out there a corps of able thinkers and writers. On the 19th of May, 1841, he delivered an ordination discourse in Boston, on "The transient and permanent in Christianity." Doctrines so astounding had never been uttered in an American pulpit. They awoke the attention of his clerical associates and of the world. The discourse was a denial of Christ and of the Bible as sources of authority,—a "denial of all authority in matters of religious faith." Parker assured the world that the question of miracles, whether true or false, was of no religious significance. "I do not believe," he says, "there ever was a miracle." He believed in "the primal intuitions of human nature, which depend on no logical process of demonstration, but are rather facts of consciousness, given by the instinctive action of human nature itself." His system could find no place on the broad platform of Unitarianism, which lost no time in disowning the child, with whose maternity it was charged.

In the old world Parker had more followers among the learned than among the masses. In the new world, he made no special appeal to the venerable University at Cambridge, where he had studied theology. It is not easy to make conservatism progressive. He appealed to a larger, and, in many respects, a more important class, and received from their ranks an enthusiastic welcome and response. To young men in the highest mercantile circles of Boston he made his appeal,—to first clerks and junior members in leading houses, many of whom were practical men, and thoughtful, if not extensive readers, some of whom had made the tour of Europe, and had studied men and things if not books. The young men who should have filled the empty pews in many a Boston sanctuary as the future hope of the Christian church, gathered in Music Hall in large numbers. They wanted life. To them Unitarianism was a cold and clammy thing. As they listened with pleasure Sabbath after Sabbath to Parker, it was not so much from any admiration or acceptance of a bold Theism or Deism, as to see him bring down his ponderous sledge-hammer on popular wrongs, or, so easily, as it seemed, to cut those old

knots of theology which the Church and God's word had ever pronounced mysteries. They wondered that the question of the authorship of sin should have so long been discussed, when a few words from the minister of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society in Boston, settled it at once and forever. What were blasphemies to the Christian heart, and even to the unregenerate youth of Christian homes, were soon heard with no abhorrence, but with delight. Wont to hear and to believe that Jesus was Lord of Lords, they were now told that He was only one among the herd, with horns a little taller than those of his fellows. They heard and they yielded a nominal assent to all that emanated from the bold assailant of the popular theology.

No such blows has American Christianity received from one of its professed teachers, as were dealt by the "*Sermon on Theism, Atheism, and the popular Theology*," and other discourses. Promulgating these new views, the leader was not only proscribed by his old associates, but he placed himself without the pale of Christianity, and while constant growth has marked the old theology, where is Parkerism? The sickness of its leader was the beginning of its own decay, and his death has hastened its final dissolution. Theists form no body in America. Those who officiate in his place, are moved more by their profound reverence for his broad humanity, than for any views which he taught of God. The man himself held his followers together. No system, no principles outliving him bound his adherents to him. His personal influence gone, they are finding other homes. We may hope that the voice of reason is leading many of them to a calm and self-satisfying faith.

While no counter movement can be honored with the name or place of a prominent phase of American Liberal Theology, this sketch would be imperfect without recording the attempts on the part of Old School Unitarianism, by proposed compromises and concessions, to bring orthodox Christianity into a closer affiliation with itself. The most able call for this union was the "*Half-Century of Unitarianism*," by Dr. Ellis. It could not be denied that there were strong orthodox ten-

dencies in the ranks of Liberal Theology. Those who should have been leaders, here, such men as Huntington, Coolidge, and others, had rapidly approached evangelical ground. They have already left their own church, and returned to Calvinism, whither conviction and feeling led them; have made known their faith in Christ as their Saviour, and in God's word in its entirety as their guide. It cannot be doubted that many others will follow them when they shall be as true to the dictates of reason and of the heart. Liberalism mourns over these defections, while truth rejoices.

And at almost the same time, in a divergent direction, though with the same end in view, Dr. Bellows was attempting to inaugurate a Broad Church. In a discourse delivered in 1859, under the imposing title of "*Suspense of Faith*," he admits an "undeniable chill in the missionary zeal, an undeniable apathy in the denominational life of the Unitarian body — a despondency, a self-questioning anxiety — a pausing posture, and self-distrust" of Liberal Theology. He concedes the "latitudinarianism, the negation, the undeotionality" complained of in the system. "Why is it," he asks, "that the moment we find ourselves in possession of men whom genius, character, and scholarship fit to lead us on in our logical career to new victories and the extension of our faith, they almost uniformly become paralyzed by doubts and scruples, and lose their interest in the progress they might assure? It is simply because the small elevation which gives them command of us, reveals to them the absence of any more roads in the direction we have been going. The moment we have given our faith to our leaders, that moment, without changing their allegiance or opinions, they have lost their own faith in themselves and our cause." At the same time he asserts that "the propagandism of Unitarian ideas is essentially paralyzed by the feeling that they are sowing themselves broadcast, not in the forms, but in the essential religious thoughts of the country and the time; and the indifference to increasing our ministers and churches is very much due to the conviction that many ministers and churches, of all names and orders, are now doing our work, if less directly, yet more

thoroughly than we could do it ourselves." Having, then, overspread the American world, some new development must be found for Unitarianism. This Dr. B. attempted. But whether he clearly understood what he wished, is doubtful. The world has not welcomed his theories. We need not attempt to explain, if we could do so, the vagaries of the "*Suspense of Faith*."

In the following year, for the purpose of enforcing the positions of this discourse, Dr. Bellows presented to the public a volume entitled, "Re-statement of Christian Doctrine," being sermons delivered by himself on different occasions. In these he seeks to point out a way of "emancipation from superstition and human authority, without the loss of a tender reverence for Divine persons and things;" to comfort "those devotional and anxious minds in our own body that, left to themselves, would abandon Unitarian Christianity altogether;" to make more easy that "faith in Christianity which is now so hard to thousands of the more thoughtful and educated classes." But we fail to find in these attempted re-adjustments of faith, anything that is very new, or of such striking importance as to demand farther consideration here. We have heard nothing for many a day of the Broad Church.

In closing this article, the aim of which has been simply historical, it should be said that American Liberalism has benefited the truth, by revealing the strength of its foundations, and by enlarging the sphere of its action. Against the movement of Parker have arisen able defenders of Christianity, both from among liberal Christians, and from among adherents to the "popular theology." The American pulpit has spoken in a thousand voices, and the result is that Parkerism is already far in its decadence. To that Rationalism which supplies the weapons now so assiduously used to undermine our faith in the Divine origin of the Scriptures withering rebukes have been given, both in England and America.

The Religion of Belsham, Wakefield and Priestley, of Channing and the Wares, has been beneficial to evangelical Christianity, by bringing out all its resources. Having among its followers men of cultivated intellect and extensive knowl-

edge, Unitarianism has presented communities surpassed for moral excellence by none on earth. It has preached the character and life of Christ. It has left doctrinal for practical Christianity. Dr, Gannett says, "The moral influence of the cross is its unsearchable mystery." To him who finds his life in the atoning efficacy of the cross, how sad a view is this, which takes away from it all that is vital, and leaves but an empty martyrdom. And yet this divorcement of morality from the atonement has led evangelical Christianity to assert her claim to the excellencies of Christ's life, and to the morals of the Bible. These are also hers. She admits no exclusive ownership on the part of others. She cannot be robbed of them. And her pulpits speak forth more freely than they were wont to do God's revealed will on all human relations. With no wrongful neglect of Christian tenets and Church formulas, there is a breadth of sweep in her view of truth, which includes all human society, and dictates their duties to the governments of man, as well as upholds the Government of God. And this position is due somewhat to the reflex influence of Liberal Christianity.

But a negative system, with no settled faith, feeble in its expiring energies, although it have all the agencies of respectability, learning, and influence, is not the religion that the heart wants. We concede what it claims for itself, the general truth that its "laity are on the same intellectual level with its leaders." We concede its elevated tone of thought and culture. But Liberal Christianity thus leaves out of its privileges the masses of mankind. For this reason it cannot be the religion of the gospel of God, "Who will have all men to come unto the knowledge of the truth." And we claim for religious leadership, no priestly domination, but a higher intellectual level than for the laity.

The Bible, in the entirety of its teachings, is made more dear to the human heart by the influence of these new theologies. For the prominent difficulty with these liberal forms of religion is, that they do not meet man's great want. "Unitarianism has forgotten that man is a sinner." This confession of Dr. Dewey needs to be well marked. But man

feels that he has greatly sinned. He needs a great salvation. Man has felt these needs through all the ages. And if it be asked who have thus felt them, if it be a question of names and numbers, we point to these. What names in any age or land will outweigh those of Pascal and Leibnitz, of Bacon and Johnson, and others in their several departments of greatness. These men believed in the magnitude of sin, and the need of an infinite salvation. Calvinism, the religion of Paul and of Christ, meets this need. And notwithstanding all its mysteries, in its ranks are found the great majority of Christendom, from its highest to its lowest levels. While we admit the charge which lies against it of acting on the passions and feelings of men, and specially on their fears and hopes, we also claim that such acting is the God's way of moving men to salvation. "Knowing the terror of the Lord we persuade men and trust also we are made manifest in their consciences": we still cling to "the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."

VOL. xxvii.—41.

ART. VII.—ARABIAN PHILOSOPHY.

[BY M. B. ANDERSON, LL. D., PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
ROCHESTER.]

- 1.—*Averrhoes et L'Averrhoesisme. Essai Historique. Par* ERNEST RENAN.
- 2.—*Dictionnaire des Sciences Philosophiques :* Par MUNCK.

<i>Art. Arabes (Philosophe des).</i>	" "
<i>Art. Ibn Sina.</i>	" "
<i>Art. Ibn Roschd.</i>	" "

No person who follows back the stream of philosophic thought, from the present time through the middle ages, to its proximate sources in the prolific intellect of the Greeks, can fail to notice the profound impression made upon the European mind by the Saracenic literature which crossed the Pyrenees from Spain. It was the desire to settle in some clear form the questions which, in the ordinary routine of a philosophical class-room, arise out of the close relation between the Moslem and Christian thinking of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, which gave rise to the following essay. The authorities made use of have in the main been the works whose titles are placed at the head of this article. These have been supplemented by such other sources of information as could most easily be made available.

It is worthy of remark, that wherever we can trace the beginning of the scientific discussion of the mental faculties, we find the determining impulse in that direction to have been given by man's moral wants and religious aspirations. It is these which start the great problems of life and being which so imperatively demand attention and solution. While the remark of Beausobre, that "heresies in religion have been

founded on previous philosophies," contains in it a partial truth; that of Stahl, that "a people's philosophy has its root in their theology," embodies one much more radical and profound. This view, endorsed by the high authority of Sir James Mackintosh, it requires little reading of the original sources of philosophy to make clear.

Wherever we search for the origin of national thinking upon strictly metaphysical problems, we always find the moral and religious forces of the soul to have been beforehand in their activity. Philosophy and religion act and re-act upon each other with extraordinary power, alternately manifesting themselves as cause and consequence. But even in these alternations of energy and passivity, a profound analysis will discover that some affirmation or denial concerning God and duty, has controlled and pervaded alike the philosopher and the seer. To these general considerations the Arabs form no exception. The advocates of the doctrine that there are essential and specific differences of mental constitution in different human races, have affirmed that the Semitic tribes are incapable of generating philosophical conceptions, and that their mental activity, in every thing relating to the soul, is limited to the acceptance and propagation of religious dogmas, embodied in lyrics or prophecy. Although we shall see hereafter that the Arabic thought was finally moulded into Greek forms, there is clear evidence of philosophic activity, at least in the germ, before the practical contact of the Greek and Arabic minds. The same general relation existed between the Greek and the Arabic mind, as between that of the Greeks and the Roman, Celtic, Slavonic and Teutonic peoples. Like the Non-Hellenic Europeans, the Arabs derived their forms of thinking, and the basis of their developed systems, from the Greeks.

If we may except the book of Job, there is no monument of abstract thought attributable to the Arabs, previous to the time of Mohammed. The Arabs estimate so lightly the knowledge of their ancestors before the advent of the Prophet, that they designate the antecedent period, as "the time of ignorance." In the first years of propagandism, the ferocious

fanaticism of the conquering Saracens, left them neither time nor disposition for the processes of philosophy. But no sooner had their new creed become established, than some independent and thoughtful minds sought for a foundation, in the nature of things, for the doctrines of the Koran. These efforts led to the formation of religious sects, and schools of instruction, which sought to defend their various dogmas by dialectic weapons, and to ground them in general views of human nature.

These philosophical tentatives generally took the form of heresies and dissent from the reigning religious faith. Among the first of these was the sect of the "Kadrites," or those who professed the doctrine of the "Kadr," or "power." The word here quoted, was used in reference to the freedom of the will. In opposition to the natural interpretation of the Koran, they believed in man's entire ability to control and determine his own actions, whether good or bad. They denied predestination, and placed the human soul beyond the control of any objective influence whatever. To these were opposed the "Djabarites," or the partisans of absolute fatalism. They denied to man all power to act freely; and affirmed that all his activity was due to external constraints. So far as the theory of the will was concerned, this school was quite in harmony with the Orthodox belief derived from the Koran. But there was taught in connection with this, the doctrine that God could not be placed in any category of being, and could be described by no attributes, qualities, or modes — views analogous to those held by Scotus Erigena.

In opposition to these notions, there arose the school of the "Cifatites," or partisans of the attributes, who interpreted literally the words of the Koran descriptive of the Almighty, and pushed their conclusions to the extreme of Anthropomorphism. At Bassora, about the first quarter of the eighth century, there arose a school, called the "Motazales," or Dissenters. This school attempted by an eclectic process to reduce to system the opinions of the various Mohammedan sects, and especially those of the "Kadrites," or partisans of freewill. Though subsequently subdivided by many shades

of opinion, these dissenters agreed generally in denying the existence of divine attributes, as distinct from the divine essence, seeking thus to modify the coarse representations of the mode of the divine existence given in the Koran; and especially to illustrate and establish the doctrine of the unity of God. They strenuously maintained the freedom of the human will, affirming that man actually creates the good and evil by which he is affected. By reason of their adhesion to these two doctrines, the unity of God and the freedom of the human will, the "Motazales" styled themselves the partisans of unity and justice, assuming that the unity of God and the justice of his government were called into doubt by the vulgar Mohammedan creed.

De Sacy, in his "*Exposition of the Religion of the Druses*," says, that the Motazales held that "all the knowledge requisite to salvation, is accessible to man by the light of reason, independently of the Koran, or any positive revelation." They naturally employed dialectic processes in defending their opinions against the literal orthodox on the one hand, and the extreme heretics on the other, between whom they sought to hold an intermediate position. This dialectic method of treating the doctrines of the Koran, either in the way of explanation, attack, or defence, was called the "Science of the Word," and it grew up into something very similar to the scholastic theology of the Christians in the middle ages. Among the Saracens, as among the Christians, a similar method of investigation and statement was adopted by the holders of views extremely diverse from each other. These general remarks will give some idea of the condition of the Moslem mind at the accession of the Abbassides to the throne of the Khaliphs, in the latter half of the eighth century. They show that the Arabians had already been exercised in dialectic subtleties, and had entered upon metaphysical discussions which prepared their minds to receive the Greek philosophical culture, and to cast their sectarian debates into still more abstract forms.

The Arabs derived their first knowledge of Greek literature from the Syriac and Chaldean Christians. The Khaliph Al

Mamoun was especially noted for his efforts to increase the influence of Greek culture among his subjects. In the first instance, translations from the Greek into Arabic were confined to works on medicine, physics, and astronomy. But these sciences among the Greeks were treated with so little division of labor, and were so much affected by strictly metaphysical methods and processes that the Arabs were soon introduced to all the subtleties of the Greek philosophers. Aristotle became, by way of eminence, their guide, and this position he seems always to have retained.

The Arabic translations of Aristotle appear to have been mainly the work of Christian writers, and especially of the Nestorians, who frequented the courts of the Khaliphs in considerable numbers as teachers and physicians. Many of these works were rendered into Arabic from Syriac versions, which had been made at an earlier period. Whether made from the Greek directly or from Syriac versions, these works appear to have been translated into Arabic with a good degree of care and exactness, having been subjected to repeated corrections and revisions. Many historians of philosophy have followed Brucker and Bayle in representing them as grossly inadequate and incorrect. The great Jewish Orientalist, Munck, the author of the Articles on the Arabic Philosophers in the *Dictionnaire Des Sciences Philosophiques*, has formed of them a much more favorable opinion. Referring to Brucker's statement, Munck speaks as follows: "*The Refutation of the Sophists*" appears in our manuscript in four different versions. The examination of the critical apparatus which this precious manuscript alone furnishes, is sufficient to convince us that the Arabs possessed translations made with the most scrupulous exactness, and that the authors who, without having seen these translations, have spoken of them as barbarous and absurd, were in a profound error. These authors have founded their judgment upon bad Latin versions, made, not from the Arabic, but from translations of the Arabic into Hebrew." The most noted of the early translators of Aristotle were a Nestorian physician named Honain Ben-Ishâk and his son. They lived at Bagdad, in the latter part of the

ninth century. Early in the tenth century, other celebrated translators revised these versions, or made new ones, and added to them the commentaries of Porphyry, Alexander of Aphrodisia, Themistius, and John Philoponus.

It was through these commentators that the Arabs first became acquainted with Plato. Although Plato's works do not seem to have been much studied among them, an Arabian author of the thirteenth century, who wrote a "*Dictionary of Philosophers*," speaks, under the article Plato, of Arabic versions of the *Republic*, the *Laws*, and the *Timæus*; and under the article Socrates, the same author cites long passages from the *Crito* and the *Phædon*. It is pretty evident, however, that the exact knowledge of the Arabs regarding Greek philosophy, was limited to Aristotle and his commentators.

Of Greek writers on the natural sciences, their information was somewhat more extended, including the *Elements* of Euclid, the works of Ptolemy, Hippocrates, Galen, and Dioscorides. In these writers the Arabs found their masters, and all their subsequent scientific attainments were founded in the study of their works. Contrary to the general opinion, Renan insists that their claim to originality in physical science is very slight, and not in any way superior to that which they can make in respect to metaphysics.

The knowledge of the works of Aristotle was soon spread into all the schools, and they were eagerly studied by all the religious sects, not, however, without exciting the suspicions of the more orthodox followers of the Prophet. De Sacy quotes an Arabic historian who laments that "the doctrines of the philosophers have given rise to the most fearful evils among the Mohammedans, philosophy having served to augment the errors of heretics, and to add to their impiety an increase of impiety." Notwithstanding the suspicion thrown upon the followers of Aristotle, his works were eagerly studied, and the opinions and psychological analysis of the great master were made available in the defence and propagation of their tenets, by all the heretics and sectaries among the Arabs. They soon commenced the task of commenting on Aristotle's works after the method of the Alexandrian and later Greeks whose

writings had become known to them. They gave to him the epithet of "the philosopher" by way of eminence, after the manner of the Christian writers of the middle ages. Though not slavishly adopted as an authority by all, he exercised a general dictatorship over the form and method of their investigations and reasonings.

The intellectual development of the Arabs manifested itself in the main at two centres — at the courts of the Eastern Khaliphs on the one hand, and in Spain on the other. The eastern writers preceded the western in point of time, and the suppression of free thought in the schools of Bagdad and Bassora by Mohammedan bigotry gave additional vigor to the philosophical development of the Mohammedans in Spain. The most celebrated of the Arabian philosophers in the East were Al Kendi, who flourished in the ninth century; Al Farabi, who lived in the tenth century, known specially for his works on logic; and the more widely celebrated Ibn Sina, or Avicenna. He was of Persian origin, and was born A. D. 980, and died A. D. 1037. He occupied a representative position among the Eastern Saracens, similar to that of Averrhoes in the West. It is around these two celebrated names, occupying respectively similar positions in the Orient and Occident, that our sketch of Saracenic thought will naturally gather. They were both followers of Aristotle, and by consequence manifest great similarity in their general views. Avicenna is best known in popular history as a physician. His Canon of Medicine was for centuries considered the text-book for the European medical student. As a philosopher he is not thought to have made any important additions to the views of Aristotle and his Neo-Platonic Commentators. In his religious opinions he professed to harmonize with the Koran, and was clear in his affirmation of the individuality of the soul; but for reasons which we shall hereafter notice, he fell under the suspicion of heresy, and was made the object of attack by the sceptic Gazali, or Algazel, who wrote, or professed to write, in the interests of the orthodox Mohammedan faith. In the minds of the Arabian philosophers who at all adhered to the popular faith, there seems to have been a constant collision

between the strict Monotheism of the Koran and the Dualistic system of Aristotle. The Mohammedan and Aristotelian doctrines of the soul were equally at variance with each other. The Greek philosopher believing in the eternity of matter, his views could not be harmonized with the Hebrew doctrine of creation, which had been incorporated into the Koran. He was by no means clear in his exposition of the relation which his "pure energy" or "form," without matter, sustained to the material universe; and consequently left in confusion, or shrouded in Cosmological speculation, his entire doctrine of God. The Aristotelian notion of the division of the soul into intelligible and sensible parts, but one of which was appropriated to human individuality, could hardly be reconciled with that personal existence of the soul so emphatically affirmed in the Koran. With the Arabian philosophers of the middle ages, the task of reconciling the doctrines of the Stagirite with the Koran was not an easy one. The doctrine of creation by a personal God, universally held by Christian philosophers, owes its origin to the Bible. This view borrowed by Mohammed from the Jews and Christians, with whom he came in contact, stands out clearly in the Koran. This doctrine, and that of the unity of God and the spiritual personality of man, are the great truths which gave power to the system of Mohammed. The Greek philosopher, with all his breadth and power of intellect, never reached these elevated and simple conceptions.

There are two hypotheses concerning the creation of man and the physical universe, radically different from each other, which may be respectively designated as Mosaic and heathen. The one supposes a Creator free, personal, omnipotent, with a constitution and attributes definite and determined, having a constant providence over the universe, holding in himself the complete causality of all things objective to himself, including the substantial, personal and immortal soul of man.

The other hypothesis involves the idea of the eternity of matter, the denial of creation, a belief in the evolution of the world from formless matter by inherent dynamic forces — God being but a name for the sum of the activities of the uni-

verse, undetermined and undistinguished, by consciousness, freedom, or personality. The resulting doctrine of the human soul makes it a mere segment of the activities of the universe, separated from the sum of being in general by no real divisions,—its individuality being [a formal and transitory mode of universal life to be absorbed, at the dissolution of the body, into the indistinguishable totality of universal being. How far Aristotle emancipated himself from this general drift of heathenism, it is not our purpose to inquire. It is clear that he never rose above the tendencies of his time, and that his doctrine of God and of the soul was radically inadequate and pantheistic.

Avicenna assumed with Aristotle the eternity of matter, but taught that the work of the Creator was simply to mould and fashion this eternally existent matter into forms of order and beauty. Adopting the Aristotelian terminology distinguishing between the "matter" and "form" of material objects, he described the Creator as the "Giver of Forms," but he encumbered this comparatively simple idea of creation, with reminiscences of oriental pantheism, like those preserved in the Jewish Cabbala, and the emanation hypotheses of the Alexandrian Platonists and the Gnostics.

Omitting, for the present, any discussion of these hypotheses which were common to all the Arabian Aristotelians, it is sufficient to say that the Mosaic doctrine of the creation received from the Koran seems to have retained a stronger hold of his mind than is generally made manifest in the writings of the Saracen philosophers of the Spanish school. It is plain that he made an attempt to harmonize the doctrine of the Koran with that which he received from other sources, whether Greek or Oriental.

In order to ascertain the doctrine of Avicenna regarding the soul, we must glance at that of Aristotle. At the basis of this great thinker's system lay the distinction between "power" and "act," between potential and actual existence. Aristotle applied this distinction to all things, man included, and in man to thought itself. In analogy with this distinction, he supposed the existence of two intellects — active and passive — an intelligible and sensible soul.

The sensible soul receives impressions of external things by virtue of its similarity to them in the mode of its existence, on the ancient principle, *simile simili cognoscitur*. The intelligible soul receives into itself the pure "form" from the sensible soul, disengaged from the material vehicle which contained it in the sense. It is the organ for the reception and manipulation of ideas — the *locus principiorum* — the faculty to which are due all the higher functions and activities of the rational being. This only is immortal. But whether this organ was held to be personal — to belong to the man, or was considered a common "light of all our seeing," has given rise to much controversy. Omitting further discussion until we notice the similar opinions of Averrhoes, we will simply recount the deductions made by Avicenna from his interpretation of his master. These deductions were three-fold :

(1) The active intellect has its existence anterior to the act of individual thought, since it is the necessary condition of all thought — thinking being impossible until its presence is actually made known.

(2) That the active intellect is without the individual, and does not make a part of the essence of his personal being;

(3) That existing without the soul of the individual man, the active intellect is the same in all.

By these deductions, he was supposed, by his contemporaries, to weaken, if not to destroy, the hope of immortality, holding every thing which pertains to the individual, and constitutes the personality of man, to belong to the sensible soul, which, according to Aristotle, pertained solely to the physical organization, and perished with the body. It is evident that however much respect was felt or feigned for the Koran by the Arabian philosophers, they did not limit their speculations by any regard to its letter.

It was natural that in the interests of Mohammedan orthodoxy, other and antagonistic speculations of an apologetic character should arise. Accordingly a school of thinkers, half sacerdotal and half philosophical, was formed, of which Gazali, or Algazel, was the leading spirit. His aim was to overthrow

the influence of the metaphysicians, by showing their views to be self-destructive, and thus to prove the necessity of relying for the discovery of truth on the divine communications made to Mohammed. Algazel was born A. D. 1038, and was educated at Bagdad. He is chiefly important in the history of Saracen speculation, as a philosophical sceptic. He belongs to the same class with Huet in France, and Glanville in England. He has somewhat in common with the distinguished Mansel of our own time. He represents himself as having gone through an examination of all the schools of philosophy, in the hope of attaining stable convictions. This course of study, however, resulted in complete scepticism. He doubted the gifts of the senses, or he thought them not certified by intelligence. He doubted the results of intelligence, because that could not prove the reality and certitude of its own principles. From this condition of doubt, he was led to adopt the mystical doctrines of the Persian Soofis, which had been incorporated into the ideas of some of the many Mohammedan sects. In the mysticism and ecstasy of the Soofis, he appears to have reached intellectual quiet, but as a writer on their doctrines he seems to have made little mark.

After becoming an adherent of the mystical party among his countrymen, he addressed himself to the work of neutralizing the influence of the philosophers, on the ground that they had weakened and corrupted the faith of his countrymen. For this purpose he wrote two treatises:—the one entitled "*Tendencies of the Philosophers*," and the other, "*Mutual Refutation*." After announcing his general design in the preface to his first book, he added, very sensibly, that it would be impossible for him to accomplish his purpose of refuting the philosophers, until their views had been expounded and their underlying principles developed. After having finished his first and preliminary work, he undertook the task of refutation, which he effected by setting in orderly opposition the conflicting arguments of the various writers on the same subjects, showing thus the futility of philosophy as a means of obtaining fixed practical convictions as guides in life.

His criticism was directed to some twenty points of physics and metaphysics, on which the philosophers had laid down conflicting statements, and on which he regarded their conclusions as untrustworthy and dangerous. The following is a portion of the analysis of the work given by Munck: (1)—The philosophers have failed to establish their doctrine of the eternity of matter, and the inherent and necessary permanence of the material world. (2)—He deemed them wrong in asserting God to be a mere plastic worker in eternally existing and uncreated matter. (3)—He also denied that by philosophy they had proved the existence of such a plastic worker at all. (4)—He denied that they could establish the unity of God, or show the falsity of the Aristotelian Dualism. (5)—He accused them of error in denying that God manifest himself under finite conditions and relations. (6)—Also in the affirmation that the First Existence or Absolute Being is an abstract entity only, incapable of being put into any category of thought or existence, or of being compared with, or distinguished from, any other being. (7)—That they failed to prove God incorporeal. (8)—That they failed to show that the world had a cause, and that by consequence they were chargeable with atheism. (9)—That their system denied to God the knowledge of particular things, or of his own existence. (10)—He denied their theory of causation, and charged them with error in affirming that the so-called laws of nature were necessary in their action. (11)—He denied their power to demonstrate the spiritual existence of the soul, or its immortality. (12)—He charged them with error in denying the resurrection and the future state of rewards and punishments.

We omit his objections to the reigning theories on physics and cosmology. It is clear, from what we have here given, that Algazel was a shrewd and able critic, with great capacity to detect the weakness of the human understanding as well as the defects of those baseless *a priori* hypotheses which formed so much of the subject matter of ancient philosophy. He illustrates also the natural sympathy between the apparently opposite poles of human thought, scepticism and mysticism.

It is interesting to meet with illustrations of universal principles in minds widely separated from each other in respect to time, culture, and conditions. Mysticism and scepticism, each has a tendency to generate the other. George Fox and his immediate followers undervalued the objective and positive elements of the Christian faith, and rested in an internal mystical illumination, distinguishable by no positive marks or tests from the workings of their own consciousness. Succeeding generations of the Friends, surrounded by the influence of this mystical culture, have furnished much more than their natural share of recruits to the ranks of the rationalists and sceptics. Large numbers of persons in our own country, educated in sceptical methods, who have passed through all the phases of religious and philosophical doubt and denial, have passed at a bound to the opposite extremes of religious and philosophical mysticism. It is worthy of remark that, during the time of the intensest sceptical activity that our own country has ever witnessed, the mystical writings of Behmen and the early Friends, of Madame Guyon and Fenelon, were in great demand. Spinoza, a philosophical mystic, whose mind had been nourished in the mystical theories of the Rabbins and the Cabbala, became the high priest of the German school who resolved the Gospel histories into personified ideas, and sapped the foundation of all objective certainty and evidence. We often see the same mind at one period absolutely rioting in doubt and denial of all sacred things, and at another adopting with enthusiastic faith the dogmas of transubstantiation and the immaculate conception. Dr. Brownson may be taken as a specimen of this class, unhappily too large. Unable, by reason of his sturdy, massive, and thoroughly objective nature, to rest in the Serbonian bog of eternal and obstinate questioning, he sought with a feverish anxiety for some solid anchorage in reality, for his storm-tossed spirit. The tradition-built fabric of Romanism, and the doctrine of perpetual miracles, were needed to satisfy the mighty hunger of his collapsed and fainting soul.

One of the most remarkable points in the criticisms of Algazel, is found in his discussion of the law of causality. In

it he has anticipated almost the entire doctrine of Hume on the same subject. His analysis of the law of cause and effect has been thought, by his admirers, the special glory and most original speculation of the Scotch sceptic. But this anticipation only proves that sceptical tendencies, in all ages, naturally lead to similar results. Although his reasoning on this subject is analogous to that of Hume, the use which he makes of it is quite different. Denying the actual relation of cause and effect between things, and denying all power of one substance or event over another, he attributes all real causation in the universe to the immediate action of the Divine Will. His doctrine presents a striking analogy to the Cartesian hypothesis of "Occasional Causes" and "Divine Assistance." We condense his reasonings and illustrations, as given by Munck, under the following heads: (1)—When two events happen in constant relation and order, it by no means follows that one is the cause of the other. The relation is one of association, not of cause and effect. He thus keenly illustrates this proposition. A person born blind, who should see for one day only, and who knew nothing of the nature of light, would suppose that he saw the objects themselves by their own impression upon his organs, and would take no account of the rays of light which are the real object or medium of vision. (2)—When one admits the action of certain causes by a law of nature, so-called, it by no means follows necessarily, that the effect under the same circumstances, and upon the same objects must always be the same. For example—cotton, without ceasing to be cotton, might take on, by the will of God, some quality by which it could resist the action of fire. In fact, what philosophers call the law of nature, or the law of causality [objective] is simply a name for what takes place uniformly by the action of the Divine Will. We admit the relation between such events to be fixed and uniform, because God, in his foreknowledge, determining that things should remain always thus, has given us the consciousness or belief of that fact. But there can be no law of nature which is immutable in itself, or limits the freedom of the Creator.

Algazel is charged with having written these books in the

interests of religion, without himself believing in the system which he defended. Renan tells us that Moses of Narbonne, in his preface to the Hebrew version of the work we are noticing, declares that Algazel wrote a little volume for some chosen friends, in which he set aside his own arguments against the philosophers. Ibn Tofail makes similar statements in a more circumstantial manner. We may suppose that, like all other sceptics, he saw that in denying the validity of sensible knowledge and the authority of consciousness, he in reality denied nothing — that he who attempts to overthrow all the bases of human belief leaves all things relatively where he found them. The mass of men can never doubt the certainty of the common facts of daily life, and if a sceptic leaves the evidence of a supernatural order upon the same foundation, he in reality accomplishes nothing but a show of sharp reasoning which can produce no conviction.

The practical effect, however, of the able works of Algazel seems to have been such as to give a death-blow to philosophical speculation at the courts of the Eastern Khaliphs. Recoiling before bigotry and opposition at the East, it arose with new expansiveness and vigor on the soil of Spain, where the Saracenic dominion had already been fully established. There is so much of uniformity in the methods and results of Arabian speculators; and they follow so closely in the steps of each other, and of Aristotle, that it would be wearisome to speak of them in detail. We pass over, without notice, the names of many distinguished men among the Arabs in Spain. We confine ourselves to a sketch of the opinions and influence of Ibn Roschd, or Averrhoes.

This great man's writings form the culminating point of philosophical culture among the Saracens. He seems to have gathered up into his own mind, and spread out in his writings the entire results of Arabic thought and investigation. A statement of his methods and opinions will cover the principal remaining ground of our sketch of Moslem philosophical development. It was mainly through the writings of Averrhoes that the Christians of the middle ages came into connection with the thinking of their enemies across the Pyrenees.

The study of his writings undoubtedly did much to excite thought and investigation in Christendom, and to promote a taste for a knowledge of the ancient philosophers in their original garb. The impression which he made upon the European mind was powerful. His opinions became mingled with the theology of the schools, and called forth in their refutation the ablest minds of the Christian church.

Though spoken of at first with respect, his name was finally mingled with the legendary history of the middle ages as the grand exemplar and representative of scoffing blasphemy and universal unbelief. It is this close connection which existed between the works of Averrhoes and the scholastic theology and apologetic, that gives so much of interest in the mind of the Christian scholar, to the views and opinions of this distinguished philosopher.

Ibn-Roschd, known in history as Averrhoes, was born in the first quarter of the twelfth century, at Cordova in Spain. He was descended from a family celebrated as magistrates in a state where, as in all Mohammedan countries, the theologian and lawyer were combined in the same person. The best authorities place his birth in the year 1120. He lived during the height of the Moslem power and civilization in Spain, and after the decline of philosophical culture among the Saracens in the East, through the influence, as we have already intimated, of the religious reaction led on by Algazel. His education was begun by a severe training in the theology and jurisprudence which had been drawn out of the Koran. Although remarkable for his proficiency in the knowledge of the Koran, and the commentaries and legal decisions by which it had been supplemented, he pushed his studies far beyond, including in them the whole range of the knowledge of his time, whether drawn from native or Greek sources. Special attention was devoted to medicine, mathematics, the philosophy of Aristotle, and his Neo-Platonic commentators. Like his father and grandfather, he served as a kadi, or magistrate, and appears to have been engaged in some sort of a diplomatic mission in Morocco.

Though he arrived at great distinction among his country-

men, he fell into disgrace at the court of the sultan Almanzor; was deprived of his political honors, and banished to the village of Lucena, near Cordova. Whether his banishment was due to some prejudice which he had incurred with a despotic court, or to the opposition which was excited against him for his philosophical opinions, it is not easy to say. Possibly both causes may have combined in producing the result. By the intercession of powerful friends he was soon released and returned once more to Africa, where he soon after died, in 1198.

It may not be improper in reference to the end which we have in view, to cast a glance at the intellectual and moral forces which agitated Europe during the period of Averrhoes' life. The twelfth century must be admitted to have been a period of intense intellectual activity, notwithstanding the inconsistency of this view with the vulgar estimate of that period. Although there was little intercommunication in the modern sense of the term, there was a rapid circulation of ideas, for the age had ideas to circulate. The rush of large bodies of young men to the universities from all parts of Christendom, and a similar impulse for a similar purpose among the Saracens — the Crusades, and the vast upheaval of thought and emotion in which they originated, and in which they resulted — the bitter conflicts regarding the limits respectively of civil and ecclesiastical power — the sudden influx into Spain of all the best results of Oriental and Hellenic thought from the courts of the Asiatic Khaliphs, could not fail to form an intellectual atmosphere stimulant of thought and passion to a degree of which we are likely to form a most inadequate conception. During the last three-quarters of the twelfth century, the seeds of ideas, events, systems, laws, and nationalities were germinating and quickening into life. Abelard, the Knight Errant of scholastic thinking, was drawing his crowds of eager listeners, while he demolished with his facile dialectic the consecrated realism of his old master and the church, or giving form and substance to the doubts and questionings of the age in his "*Sic et Non*." Bernard of Clairvaux, positive, mystic and

realist, was thundering on behalf of threatened obedience and orthodoxy, and organizing that system for the compression of thought within the Roman church, which culminated in the crusades against the Waldenses, and made possible in later times the tortures of Torquemada. Peter of Clugny was defending the Christian faith against Jew and Saracen, whose unholy activity of thought was even then felt and feared more than the spear or scimitar of the Moslem warrior. Peter the Lombard, was elaborating at Paris his four Books of Sentences, destined for generations to shape and determine the theological and metaphysical activity of European Christendom. During this period Aben-Ezra "the Wise," revived the exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures in Spain; and David Kimchi prepared his Hebrew grammar and lexicon. Jewish scholars, physicians, and bankers were scattered over Europe, bearing with them everywhere the intellectual spoils of the Rabbins, the Greeks, and the Arabs. England, under the Norman kings, was becoming a consolidated monarchy, already excited by the collisions between the temporal and ecclesiastical power. The constitutions of Clarendon had decided the dispute against the church, and established the predominance of civil over canon law. Arnold of Brescia, with a foresight which the present condition of Italy more than vindicates, labored to save Rome from the temporal control of the Papacy, and to restore to the church apostolic freedom, and to the city the old franchises of the Republic. During this period the sacramental system of the Roman church was developed amid strong opposition. The Waldenses made their protests against the corruptions of the hierarchy, and, like the Saracens of the East, were made the object of a bloody and exterminating war. During this period Gratian made his collection of ancient canons, giving currency anew to the forged Decretals of Isidore, laying in fraud the basis of the Papal supremacy. During this period the Pandects of Justinian were discovered at Amalfi, and that intense impulse given to the study of the Roman law which collected at Bologna students from all parts of Europe. In this period the war of the Hohenstaufen Emperors re-

garding Investitures, was carried on. Guelf and Ghibeline were arrayed against each other in Italy; and the Holy Roman empire was set in deadly array over against the Holy Roman church. By literature and arms that long strife was begun, which in our time, under the alias of the "Roman question," has baffled alike the statesmanship of Cavour, and the physical power of Napoleon.

Toward the East all eyes were turned, where Barbarossa "the Xerxes of the middle ages," Philip Augustus, and Cœur de Lion, were contending with the genius of Saladin, and the still fresh enthusiasm of the Moslem. It is not strange that in such an age, when all the fundamental principles of life and society were casting off the old, and taking on the new—when the two mightiest moral forces of earth were measuring their strength in deadly conflict for the control of the world, that the young Saracen should have found his great natural powers excited to the intensest activity, and furnished with the largest career. Although little is known of the details of his early life, we may safely assume that his celebrity in the pursuits peculiar to the Spanish Arabs was well founded. It is a remarkable fact, that of his personal history so little is known. The persecutions which arose against the philosophers soon after his death, almost entirely obliterated the name and memory of the great commentator from the Arabic literature and mind. In the excitement of this reaction whole libraries of philosophical writings were destroyed. This bigotry and fanaticism affected both princes and people, and left the greatest names which illustrate the Saracenic annals to be saved from oblivion by Jewish and Christian historians alone. The burning of works on philosophy is said to have been one means adopted by the usurper Almanzor to secure popularity among his subjects. Renan quotes the following passage from an Arabic writer: "It is well known how Almanzor conceived the idea of destroying, within his states, all works treating of logic and philosophy, giving orders that all books of this sort which could be found should be publicly burned. It is known also how he sought to abolish the study of the sciences by persecuting men who were devoted to their pursuit, punishing severely those

convicted of possessing scientific works, or of hiding them in their libraries." It is evident that the philosophical culture of the Mohammedans, either in the East or West, was but a passing phenomenon which never affected the mass of the people, nor could be made consonant with the genius of their religious system. In giving a sketch of the opinions of Averrhoes, as a specimen and resumption of the philosophical achievements of his countrymen, it is proper that allusion be made to the works of a literary and scientific character which occupied his life, and have been transmitted to us by their contents or titles. We give the following sketch on the authority of Renan. Upon philosophy, in the ancient sense of that term, there are attributed to him twenty-nine different treatises. Among these may be named his celebrated refutation of Algazel, a work concerning "the material intellect," an abridgment of Logic, Prolegomena to Philosophy, a Commentary on the Republic of Plato, and another on a treatise on the intellect by Alexander of Aphrodisia. Among them are five treatises on Theology, nine different treatises on Jurisprudence, including three volumes of cases decided in the Courts and a complete course of Mohammedan Legal Study; three works on Astronomy, including an abridgment of the Almagest, and a treatise on the motions of the celestial spheres, two works on Grammar and seventeen on Medicine. The suspicion under which Averrhoes fell, of being false to the national faith, and the general destruction of works on philosophy by Almanzor, have already been alluded to as accounting for the feeble impression made by the great Commentator on the generations of his countrymen succeeding his own. His memory and works received no better treatment from the Spanish conquerors of the Saracens. Spanish bigotry devoted Arabian literature to indiscriminate destruction. Eighty thousand manuscripts are said to have been burned by the direction of Cardinal Ximenes, in the streets of Granada alone. It has thus come to pass that Arabic copies of the metaphysical works of Averrhoes are exceedingly scarce. But two libraries in Europe, according to Renan, the Laurentian library at Florence, and that of the Escorial in Spain, possess

exemplars of the Arabic text of any portion of his philosophical writings. The Arabic texts of his medical works are less rare. But Hebrew versions of all his works, made by the Spanish Jews, exist in great abundance. It is from these Hebrew versions that most of the Latin translations, which are so numerous, have been made. From these versions, made at second hand from the Hebrew, most historians of Philosophy have formed their estimates of Arabic translations of Greek authors. According to Renan, no part of the Arabic text of Averrhoes has ever been printed. Two small works of his in Hebrew versions have been published, one at Trent in 1560, and another at Leipsic. Down to the end of the sixteenth century, Latin translations of the whole or parts of his works were frequently published.

There is much of uniformity in the course of thought adopted by the different Arabic philosophers. In making clear the opinions of Averrhoes we pass of necessity over a track similar to that which introduced our remarks upon Avicenna. Averrhoes entered into his predecessor's labors, adopted the same masters and combated similar theological views.

Like the scholastics of the middle ages, the Arabs affected mainly the character of commentators on Greek authors, especially Aristotle. They came to the knowledge of Greek philosophy after the reaction which carried the second generation of the Alexandrian school from Neo-Platonism toward the doctrines and authority of Aristotle. The commentators, Themistius, Simplicius and John Philoponus, determined the peculiar form of Aristotelianism which was received by the Arabs. They accepted the Greek culture as it came to them. The Peripateticism of the Saracens retained, throughout, the impress of the later Alexandrian school of commentators. It was modified also, as we have already hinted, by the mystical philosophy of the Persians and Hindoos, which pre-occupied the minds of many who by conviction or compulsion, had received the doctrines of the Prophet. Averrhoes did not present himself as the founder of a system. He was imbued with that extreme reverence for the authority of Aristotle so universal in his time. In his treatise on the "*Generation of*

Animals," he says of Aristotle, that "he occupies the highest elevation to which any man in any age has been able to arrive. It is to him that the Almighty makes allusion when he says in the Koran 'this superiority God gives to whom He will.'" His faith in the genius of the Greek philosopher was as exclusive as it was absolute. Never assuming to present a new system, he always takes the humble place of a commentator upon the works of the great master. But even in so doing there was place found for a certain degree of originality. A multitude of points in Aristotle's works are left obscure, or his conclusions merely hinted at. These the commentators have essayed to explain or to supplement. In so doing they have made distinct and original essays on the topics in hand. In this way much original thought was demanded, which gave free play to the mental activity of the commentator. These discussions, which often stand apart, independent of the opinions of Aristotle, when collected and analyzed, form a body of original doctrine which characterize the distinct opinions of each writer, and determine his place in the history of speculation. It is in this way only that Averrhoes can be ranked among original writers upon Philosophy.

At the risk of some appearance of repetition, we will refer once more to the opinions current among the Mohammedan sects at the time of Averrhoes. Discussions between the partizans of free will and necessity were still rife. The attributes of God were made the subject of fierce contention and the basis of schisms among the faithful. On the one hand, the idea of God was evaporated in meaningless definitions. His power to reveal himself in any proper sense through finite relations was denied, and the idea of his personality passed away into abstractions ineffable and inconceivable. On the other hand, the infinite nature of God was held to be commensurate with the conceptions which we form of him, or to be literally represented in the figurative descriptions of the Koran. He was believed by some to have a corporeal form in the exact likeness of man, to occupy one place, and to sit on an actual throne. Others sought to estab-

lish an intermediate eclectic doctrine of God, attempting by negative definitions and limitations to avoid the extremes of abstractionism, while they guarded the interpretations of the Koran from anthropomorphic materialism which degraded without illustrating the Divine Being.

There were others who, renouncing all hope of finding truth among the different sects, rested their faith in the decisions of the Imaum. The partisans of the infallibility of the Imaum became closely connected with the Mohammedan disciples of the Cabbala, who sought for truth in letters and numbers. We have already alluded to the Motazales, who formed a school of rationalists among the Mohammedans, somewhat similar in its basis to that of Schleiermacher in our own time. They held to the complete sufficiency of human reason to meet all the religious necessities of man, and that all revelation was simply an expression of the divine will through the higher functions of the human reason. This form of rationalism finds its fullest expression in a work called the "*Encyclopedia of the Brothers of Sincerity*." It was a tentative toward the conciliation of philosophy and the vulgar faith. In addition to these sects of real or of doubtful orthodoxy, there were numbers of bold and positive deniers of the entire doctrines of the Koran. They propagated their principles under the cover of secret associations. Under the veil of these orders they taught and practised the most revolting immoralities. Those initiated exhibited a strange combination of fanaticism and incredulity, of licentiousness and enthusiasm. The general formative law of these associations was universal license and universal unbelief.

The apologetic theology of the time was especially active in its opposition to the errors of the various sects, and especially to the views of the philosophers who sought to establish and popularize the doctrines of Aristotle. They maintained against the Aristotelian Dualism, the creation of matter, the existence of a free, personal God, separate from the world which he had created, though continually acting upon it. They exaggerated the fatalism of the Koran by affirming that every kind and mode of existence and activity, whether nega-

tive or positive, was immediately the work of God. Even the soul of man and the physical universe they held alike to be merely protracted volitions of the infinite mind. They denied the reality of physical causation in nature, affirming God to be the sole being in whom the attribute of power really exists. The representatives of this scholastic Mohammedan theology were the natural enemies of the philosophers. It was against them and their system that the philosophical writings of Averrhoes were directed. While commenting on the works of Aristotle, he covertly carried on a vigorous polemic against the theologians. The doctrine of Averrhoes was a bold and vigorous interpretation and development of Aristotle and his later Greek commentators. So far as his views were positive, they gathered themselves around the illustration and defence of the peripatetic doctrine of "the eternity of matter" and the separate organization of the "intelligible" and "sensible soul."

In his commentary on the twelfth book of the metaphysics of Aristotle, Averrhoes speaks as follows: "There are two opposite opinions upon the origin of beings, making allowance for some varieties of hypothesis intermediate between them. The one is the theory of development; the other that of creation. The partisans of development hold that generation is merely the drawing out of one being from another — a change of form in the same substance. The active principle in this process has no function but to draw out an endless procession of beings, and by these varying forms to distinguish them from each other. It is evident from this that its functions are those only of a moving force. The partisans of creation affirm that the active principle or being can create actually and completely without the necessity of preëxisting matter. This is the opinion of the Motecallemin [scholastic theologians] of our religion and of the Christians, John Philoponus, for example, who pretend that the possibility of creation resides of necessity in the agent alone." He then proceeds to specify two varieties, or rather potencies, of the theory of development. After saying that both of these varieties are in accord in the belief that generation is nothing but a transmutation of sub-

stance already existing, and that nothing is engendered, except from something similar to itself, he proceeds to define the first of them, evidently referring to the views of Avicenna. In this variety (he says in substance) the active principle creates first the "form" or type, and then impresses it upon the "matter" already existing. On this principle, the part of the Creator is that of the "Giver of Forms." This notion of Avicenna seems to have been adopted with a view to a partial introduction into his philosophical system of the doctrine of creation held among his countrymen. Aristotle, as interpreted by Averrhoes, reduced creation, or rather generation, to a mere movement which struck out the "form," and united it with "matter" in the same indivisible act. This movement was merely that necessary process by which the new substance generated passed over from the potential to the actual state. Averrhoes disdained making any concessions to the beliefs or prejudices of his countrymen. He adopted with boldness and even exaggerated the doctrine of Aristotle on the creation and the constitution of the soul. The following passage quoted by Renan, gives his estimate of the views of his religious contemporaries and of Avicenna: "Nature," says he, "produces all things with order and perfection, although without reason, yet just as if guided by a superior intelligence. These proportions and that productive energy which the movements of the sun and stars give to the elements, are what Plato calls 'ideas.' In the opinion of Aristotle, the supreme agent creates no "form," for if that were so, something would be produced out of nothing. This is the false notion in accordance with which "forms" have been represented as the results of creation, and has led certain philosophers to believe that forms are something *real*, and that there is an actual "Giver of Forms." It is this same notion which has led the theologians of the three religions which exist in our time, to say that something can be drawn out of nothing. Taking their departure from this idea, the theologians of our religion have supposed that a single agent could produce all beings without any intermediate agencies; and that his power could be exercised at the same instant in an infinitude of opposite and con-

tradictory acts. According to this hypothesis fire does not burn, nor water moisten; every thing which exists has need of a special and direct creative act. Furthermore, when a man throws a stone, they pretend that the action does not appertain to the man, but to the universal agent. They thus destroy the activity of man. But there is a more surprising consequence still; if God can cause anything to pass from non-being to being, he must be able to make it pass from being to non-being again. Destruction, as well as generation, is the work of God. Death itself is a creation of God. In our opinion, on the contrary, destruction is an act of the same nature as generation, every being engendered carries in itself corruption potentially. To create, the active agent does nothing but to cause a being to proceed from potential to actual existence. Destruction is simply the converse of the process." All the doctrine of Averrhoes upon creation, all the foundation of his arguments against the theologians, is suggested in this essential passage.

We condense from Renan the following exposition of his mode of applying to details his hypothesis of creation. Generation is nothing but a movement; all movements suppose a something moved. This unique something, this universal potentiality, is the "first matter." It is endowed with receptivity, but has no positive quality whatever, being equally fitted to take on the most contrary forms and modifications. This "first matter" is not susceptible of any characteristic name or definition. It is nothing but simple possibility. Every substance is thus eternal by its matter, or its possibility of being. To say that a substance has passed from non-existence into being, is to say that it possesses a capacity which it never had. The matter of substances has never been engendered, and is therefore incorruptible. The series of generations of being is infinite, *a parte ante* and *a parte post*; all that is possible to be will pass into actual existence. Otherwise there will be a cessation of activity in the universe. Hence in eternity there will be no difference between that which is potential and that which is actual. Order will not precede disorder, nor disorder order. Movement will not precede

repose, nor repose precede movement. Movement is eternal and continuous, for all movement has its cause in a preceding movement. Time does not exist otherwise than by movement. We do not measure time, except by the change of state which we observe in ourselves. If the movement of the universe should cease, we should cease to measure time, that is to say, we should lose all perception of the succession of life and existence. We measure time in sleep only by the movements of our imagination. When the sleep is very profound, and we cease to be conscious of the movement of the imagination, we cease to be conscious of the movement of time. Movement alone constitutes the "before" and "after" in duration. Thus, without movement, there would be no successive revolutions of being, or in other words, there would be non-existence.

From this it results that the mover or moving force does not act freely, as the Motecallemin contend. Avicenna, who made to them so many concessions, imagined his classification of existence into the possible and the necessary. He put the world in the category of the possible, and supposed that it could have been different from what it actually is. But how can we call that possible or contingent of which the cause is necessary in its action? "The world could not be greater or less than it is. . . . God does not take cognizance of particular events, but only of the general laws of the universe. He is occupied with species and classes to the exclusion of the individual. If he took cognizance of individual acts and beings, there would be perpetual change or innovation in his being. Again, if God governs the world immediately, the evil of the universe must be held as his immediate work. . . . The only reverential idea of God is that which reduces his providence to being the general reason of things. On this hypothesis all that is good in the world is attributable to him, since he has produced it. Evil, on the contrary, is not his work, but is the fatal consequence of matter having contradicted his designs."

So far Averrhoes seems to have been a faithful and intelligent interpreter of the views of Aristotle, as expressed in the

first and seventh books of the *Physics*, and the twelfth book of the *Metaphysics*. An indeterminate element, "matter," and determinative, limiting and conditioning element, "form," lie at the basis of the whole Peripatetic system. This is equally true in reference to both the worlds of matter and mind. It is evident that to Averrhoes and Aristotle God was but a name for the general order or reason of things. The fundamental elements of personality and creative-power did not enter into this conception, matter and form being alike uncreated. This ceaseless and orderly movement, which they recognized in the universe, was similar to that which in modern times has been personified by those who would exclude a personal God from the universe, under the names of "nature" and "law." Their "first matter," or universal potentiality, seems, from their use of the terms, to have been little else than a concept of the mind. Their "form" was but a name for the vital and organic forces which limit and differentiate the various classes of organized existences. At bottom their notions seem to have been pantheistic. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they looked upon all parts of the universe of existence as really identical in nature, as a boundless ocean upon whose surface there rolled eternally the ever oscillating and shifting waves of individuality. The simplicity of our conception of that invisible and organizing force which controls the physical universe, makes it extremely difficult to form an adequate idea of the complicated hypotheses which represented among the ancients, and especially in the East, the meagre amount of their physical and astronomical knowledge. On the basis of some vague statements of Aristotle concerning the nature of the heavenly bodies, as living beings subordinated to each other in a sort of hierarchy, Averrhoes developed the idea of a vast and complicated system of intelligences who occupied the immense chasm between the "first mover" and the world. The heavens, according to Averrhoes, constitute a living being, composed of many orbs, representing the members essential to life, in which the "first mover" represents the heart, from which life rays out to all the other members. Each orb has its own intellect which is its "form," in the Aristotelian sense of

the word, as the rational soul is the "form" of man. These intelligences hierarchially subordinated, constitute the chain of forces which propagate movement from the first sphere to this. Desire is the motive force by which they are all influenced, each seeking after something better than its own state. This movement is unceasing, for the appetite for the better condition is constant in its exercise. Their intellects are always in action, and exercise themselves without fatigue, and without imagination or sensibility. These intelligences are self conscious, and have knowledge of all that takes place in the inferior spheres. The first intelligence, consequently, has knowledge of all that passes in the universe. "The Government of the universe," says Averrhoes, "resembles the government of a city where everything moves out from the same centre, but where everything is not the immediate work of the Sovereign." He conceived and described an intermediate ministry for the abstract and invisible "prime mover," in order to bring him into relations with the universe. This ministry was made up of a series of analogues, images, and manifestations of that power which was itself sealed up in the depths of absolute existence. It is thus that a few vague and indefinite statements, in a passage of the *Metaphysics*, of perhaps doubtful authenticity, has, in the hands of the Arabs, become a complete theory of the universe, ingeniously bound together in all its parts and holding a close relation to their entire scientific system. It forms in fact the most distinctively Oriental portion of the Arabic philosophy and connects it with the Cabbala, Sabeism and the innumerable sects of Gnostics which vexed and corrupted the Oriental Christian Churches. The sublime mechanical hypothesis of Newton so profoundly penetrates our view of the system of the universe, that all the conceptions of antiquity and of the middle ages appear like dreams of beings of another race. It is a matter of great difficulty for persons imbued so completely with modern ideas, to put themselves in a position to estimate adequately the *De Cælo* of Aristotle, or the *Substantia Orbis* of Alexander. The homogeneity of the universe had not then been conceived. The doctrine of "matter and form" controlled absolutely their scientific conceptions. They

ensouled each species of beings with a "form" which was its essence and characteristic mark. The end of their scientific inquiry was the search after these essential forms. Holding these forms to constitute the limit of scientific investigation, they so specialized their inquiries that they became lost in a mass of unclassified details. Searching after the "form" of special beings, they reached none of those grand and comprehensive laws of which all the kingdoms of nature are alike illustrative. The investigation of the influence of the Aristotelian doctrine of "form and matter" upon the scientific development of the ancient and middle ages, has hardly yet been made with the care due to its importance. The great reformatory work of physical inquirers after the revival of learning was to overcome its influence and set aside its authority. In their earnestness to replace it by the modern notions of forces and laws, they attacked Aristotle's name and entire influence and teaching with merciless severity. It is only since this reform was thoroughly effected that the students of physical science have been able to estimate the debt which the world owes to the genius and labors of Aristotle. The Cosmological notions of Averrhoes were in some sense a logical development and application to the heavenly bodies of this cardinal principle of the great master. Averrhoes then is not alone in his notions of the universe, but, with some little modification, he reflects the general opinions of his own age, and even of times reaching almost to the epoch of Newton. As the theory of the planetary intelligences adopted by Averrhoes is an amplified commentary of some passages in the twelfth book of the *Metaphysics*, so his theory of the intellect is in like manner an expansion of the views of Aristotle given in the "*De Anima*," modified and supplemented by the Oriental mysticism and subtlety, which so deeply affected the Arabic mind. We quote the following passage from the 3d book chapt. 5th of this remarkable work :

"As every nature contains two principles, the one material (in which lie all things potentially), the other formal and efficient (as art stands related to the material substance) so of necessity must the same differences exist also in the soul. The

nature of the passive intellect consists in becoming all things, that of the active in causing all things, acting analogously to light, which causes to exist in actuality the colors which before existed potentially. This intellect is separate, impassive, and unmixed, being in its essence active. For always the active is held in higher esteem than the passive, and the *principium* than matter. . . . And being separated it is simple and absolute, and this only is immortal and eternal. And we do not remember [its preëxistent acts] because it is impassive; but the passive intellect is perishable, and without the active puts forth no act of intelligence."

This passage from Aristotle is the basis of the theory of the intellect adopted by the entire range of Arabian philosophers properly so called. We have already alluded to its influence upon the mind of Avicenna, and it reappears in an exaggerated form in the work of Averrhoes. It is easy to see what consequences are to be drawn from this statement of Aristotle, by one who accepted it as an authority not to be questioned. If the receptive or passive intellect is that only which pertains to the personality of man, and that perishes with the body, all foundation for a distinct personal existence in future life is swept away. If the active intellect comes from without, and furnishes the universal elements in thought, which by their necessity must be the same in all, the conclusion would be a very natural one that this objective intellect in which these universal elements reside, must be a unique and identical substance, manifesting itself only as it comes to the surface in the mental activity of individual human organizations, whose thinking it completes and renders possible. From this point of view the receptive capacity of the mind is but an attribute of man's physical organization. The active intellect is but the out-cropping of the common intellectual life of the universe temporarily limited and conditioned by the animal organization. The higher processes of thinking are but waves of an all-enveloping atmosphere of being. It has been justly said that this doctrine is very little in harmony with the general spirit of Aristotle's system. It only shows that his system, like that of every human thinker, fails in har-

mony and consistency among its parts. The doctrine of the individuality of the human soul can hardly be said to have been clearly conceived or expressed by any of the ancient philosophers. The νοῦς of Anaxagoras was the spiritual principle of the universe. Aristotle is supposed with good reason to have adopted from him the idea. All the Alexandrian school taught the procession or emanation of individual intelligences from the universal intelligence. The realism which manifests itself so obtrusively among the fathers of the Christian church was owing to their failure to apprehend what is alike the ultimate deliverance of the human consciousness and the teaching of revelation—the distinct individuality of the human soul. This failure to apprehend the unity and individuality of the soul given in consciousness, so strange and abhorrent to a well instructed modern mind, was probably the prevailing error of philosophers, strictly so called, up to the time of the revival of letters. Any one familiar in any degree with the scholastic theologians, knows how constantly and how earnestly they struggled to harmonize the individualism of the sacred oracles with the philosophy which they accepted with such undoubting trust. Even Thomas Aquinas made the individuality of the soul to depend upon its organization into a material body. The peripatetic theory of the soul as it appears in the writings of the ancient and mediæval commentators, exhibits with greater or less clearness the following points:

1st. The distinction of the two intellects, active and passive, from each other.

2nd. The incorruptibility of the active, and the perishable nature of the passive intellect.

3rd. The conception of the active intellect, as something external to the human personality, and the light of all intelligence.

4th. The unity and identity of the active intellect, wherever manifested.

5th. The identification of the active intellect with the highest of the intelligences which constitute and control the heavenly bodies, and fill up the chasm between the absolute and supreme intelligence, and the earth.

Upon the first two of these points the thought of Aristotle is clear ; upon the third there seems to be comparatively little question. The two last named are more doubtful, but there are many of his commentators who, by reconciliation of conflicting statements, and induction of passages from different works, have made out for them a reasonable claim to be considered the doctrine of the great master. The immediate disciples of Aristotle occupied themselves mainly with that part of the peripatetic psychology which had to do with the physical organization and the senses. At a later period, under the influence of the Neo-Platonic school, Alexander and others laid hold of the notions of Aristotle contained in the third book of the *De Anima*. It was this which gave the first impulse to that earnest study which this book received during the whole period of the middle ages. Alexander was followed in this respect by most of the Greek commentators who succeeded him. In all of these the part played by the active intellect is exaggerated, and the tendency to represent the doctrine of Aristotle to be a denial of human individuality, constantly increases. It is in developing certain portions to the exclusion of others, that the Arabs have changed the aspect of the peripatetic philosophy. They seem to have given the preference to those parts which are rather incidental to the system considered as a whole, and marked by an unusual obscurity. We have seen what this course resulted in when applied to the isolated cosmological hypotheses of the twelfth book of the *Metaphysics*. A similar tendency toward the logical development of vague and incomplete statements affects the Arabian commentaries on the *De Anima*. In the opinion of Averrhoes, the active intellect had an objective existence, and the act of knowledge took place by the concurrent action of this, with the subjective or passive intellect. The passive intellect Averrhoes held to be personal, material, perishable, inasmuch as it had to do with the variable and contingent, and what pertained to the specific individuality of each man. The active intellect, on the contrary, he held to be in its existence entirely separate from any individual man, exempt from all mixture with

matter—that to which the notion of number was not applicable otherwise than by its being participated in by individuals, as the “light of all their seeing,”—that it was not to be appropriated to any one being upon whom its rays were shed. The personality of consciousness was even less clearly apprehended by the Arabs than by the ancients generally. The unity of the universal mind struck them with far greater force than the conscious individuality and manifold variety of the reason developed in, and belonging to, the human soul. Assuming that all parts of the Universe were so many living beings, having each a similar organization of matter and form, they considered human thought in its *ensemble* as the resultant of objective and superior forces, as a general phenomenon of the universe, unspecialized and unappropriated to the individual. As everywhere in the infancy of abstract thought, little attention was given to the analysis of facts, vague ontological speculations were preferred to the sober and limited teaching of psychological experience.

There is a remarkable similarity between Averrhoes’ statements and those of Coleridge, Cousin, and the German Pantheists whose views they have adopted. “Reason,” says Cousin, “is literally a revelation, a necessary and universal revelation, which is wanting to no man, and which enlightens every man on his coming into the world. Reason is the necessary mediator between God and man, the Logos of Pythagoras and Plato, the word made flesh which serves as the interpreter of God and the teacher of man, divine and human at the same time. . . . Every man thinks, every man therefore thinks God, if we may so express it. . . . Every where present, he (God) returns as it were to himself in the consciousness of man, of which he indirectly constitutes the mechanism and phenomenal triplicity by the reflection of his own nature and of the substantial of which he is the absolute identity.”

In the first volume of *The Friend* Coleridge says: “I should have no objection to define the Reason, with Jacobi and his Hemsterhius, as the organ bearing the same relation to spiritual objects, the universal, the eternal, the necessary, as the

eye bears to material and contingent phenomena. But then, it must be added, that it is an organ identical with its appropriate objects. Thus God, the soul, eternal truth, etc., are the objects of reason; but they are themselves reason."

"Reason" says Dr. Hickok "is not a fact, a thing that has been made, but from its own necessity of being can be conceived no otherwise than as a verity which fills immensity and eternity."

A similar notion is involved in the following passage from Mallebranche: "Man is finite, but the reason he consults is infinite. . . . But if it be true that Reason, whereof all men participate, be universal and infinite; if it be true that it is immutable and necessary; it is certain that it differs not from that of God himself. . . . This Reason, therefore, is not distinct from him [God], but is coeternal and consubstantial with him."

It is clear that these statements of modern Metaphysicians would lead to conclusions quite as troublesome as those which have been drawn from Aristotle by the Arabian commentators. It is not strange that moderns holding such opinions and striving to harmonize them with the actual facts of mind, should make a similar attempt on behalf of Aristotle and his Alexandrian and Arabian commentators, and find in the *intellectus agens* nothing but a faculty of the soul conversant with the regulative, constitutive and universal elements of thought. This attempt has actually been made, but we need to beware of projecting modern opinions into ancient forms of expression; our object should be to seek what the ancient writers in their early essays in mental analysis really arrived at and believed—to get their errors as well as their truths. The Pantheistic tendency naturally takes on similar modes of expression in ancient and modern times. Those who find in the definitions of the reason in the passages quoted, an adequate analysis of the actual constitution of the human soul, can hardly refuse to accept the more bold, clear and consistent statements of Averrhoes. The real individuality of our entire thinking being is the most radical, obtrusive and constantly affirmed fact of human consciousness. To deny or to extenuate this

affirmation is to destroy or weaken all the foundations of morality and religion. Any philosophical system which fails to take account of this fundamental fact carries error on its very front. We cannot relieve Averrhoes from the absurdities of his doctrine by identifying it with later statements of similar views. His constant affirmation of the externality of the active intellect to man—that the immortality of the soul is merely the continuous existence of our race, which never disappears from the earth, are conclusive regarding the class to which he belongs. With him man is but a form in which the universal force, life or intellect, which appears in different modes and potencies in all parts of the universe, manifests itself and becomes self conscious. With him individuality is temporary and phenomenal only. It is a segment of the universal intellect common to all intelligent beings exercising the function of thought through a single material organization.

It would be improper to conclude this rapid sketch without an allusion to the doctrine of "union" between the sensible soul and the active intellect, which was so constantly discussed by the Saracenic writers.

They supposed it possible for the individual element in man to arrive at an intimate union with this universal intelligence, or to a sort of indentification with it. They supposed that the active intellect exercised upon the receptive soul two distinct functions,—one was to enable it to perceive the intelligible; the other was to draw it upward to a union with the universal intellect. Arrived at that state, man becomes like God, and comprehends all things, by the universal reason which he has appropriated. The mode in which this union could be effected was a subject of constant discussion. Some supposed it to be brought about by ascetic observances. Others supposed the same result could be obtained by mystical contemplation and the exclusion from the thoughts of all ideas connected with the senses. It is this doctrine of the absorption of the soul into the universal intelligence by ascetic observances or contemplation, or both combined, which shows the connection of the Saracen philosophers with the mystical sects of India and Persia. Averrhoes taught a different doctrine of union. Re-

jecting the asceticism and mysticism of many of his contemporaries, he taught the union of the individual soul with the universal intellect by "science." It is accomplished when, by contemplation and study, a man has drawn aside the veil of things, and finds himself face to face with transcendental truth. The end of human life is to make the superior part of the soul triumph over sensation; when this is accomplished paradise is attained. But this happiness is rare, and reserved only to great men. By the doctrine of union Averrhoes seems to have understood little else than the becoming cognizant of the great fundamental principle of his system—the oneness of the human intellect, so called, with the universal soul. This appears to have been the drawing aside of the veil of things, and standing face to face with transcendental truth. In the constant and uniform activity of nature, he saw but so many manifestations of the same force which generated the thoughts of his own soul. It was the consciousness of this that "science" accomplished for him. The union between the sensible and intellectual was complete when he came to identify his own individuality with the universal sum of being. The thought which impresses itself most strongly upon the mind, in reviewing the doctrines of the Alexandrian and Arabic commentators upon Aristotle, is the substantial similarity of their processes and results, with those of the modern schools of Pantheistical philosophers. We have the same neglect or denial of the facts of consciousness, and the same "*a priori*" methods in physics. We have similar results regarding the certainty of knowledge, the foundations of morality, and revealed religion. Pantheism, so far from being the last word of philosophy, as is the boast of its modern professors, is found to be the mere alphabet of abstract thought, and to belong to the infancy rather than to the manhood of philosophical culture.

It was a part of our plan to sketch the influence of Arabic thought upon the Jews and Christians during the middle ages, and especially to notice the dying struggles of Averrhoism in the University of Padua. But we have already exceeded reasonable limits, and must close.

ART. IX.—BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

I. COR. XV., 29.

[BY A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER.]

WE trust that our readers will pardon us for recurring yet once again to that much vexed, but interesting passage which speaks of a class who are baptized for the dead. It is not, we believe, in the slightest controversial spirit that we wish to restate briefly the exposition given in our article in the January number of the *Review*, in connexion with one on the same subject in the number for July, by Rev. Dr. Chase. As, in his discussion of the subject, he has done us the honor to refer to our article, we are sure that he will not deem it discourteous if we offer a few comments on the view which he has himself advocated in his scholarly and most excellent article. Our only wish is to advance the cause of truth, and to aid, if possible, to a right understanding of a passage which has thus far baffled the sagacity of biblical scholars. For the most intricate lock there is one appropriate key, which, and which alone, will fit all its wards. So for every passage which proceeds from an intelligent pen, there is one just interpretation, and this, when fairly and fully presented, will so harmonize with all the demands of the passage, and afford so complete a solution of its difficulties, that it will gradually grow into general acceptance. We would entertain no overweening confidence, but such we believe to be the explanation of this passage which was presented in our article.

The purpose of our article was twofold : first negative, then positive ; first to discredit and destroy an interpretation which has recently found currency among our ablest com-

mentators, viz., that the passage refers to a custom existing at Corinth, of baptizing living persons for the benefit of dead ones ; and then of establishing what we believed to be the true view, viz., that the passage refers to baptism as pledging its subjects, especially in the apostolic times, to suffering and death. In doing this, we passed over with a single sentence the view which Dr. Chase has advocated, viz., that the baptism referred to was a baptism for the dead with reference to and in the belief of their resurrection. We stated in brief that this was a mode of viewing baptism entirely just in itself, and which might, with no violent ellipsis, be drawn out of the words here used ; but that we deemed it liable to the fatal objection of not being in harmony with the apostle's line of thought. Dr. Chase's very scholarly and Christian discussion has failed to change our views. We still think that, correct as it is in itself to say that Christians are baptized in the hope and belief of the resurrection of the dead, and easily as that view might in another context be drawn from the words before us, it is not the view which the context naturally suggests to us here.

With a large portion of the views contained in Dr. Chase's article we cordially agree. The significance of baptism as connected with the death and resurrection of Christ, and as founded, in part at least, on the outward form of the ordinance, is too clearly presented in the New Testament, and is too obvious in itself, to be matter of rational doubt. Baptism seems at least trebly significant. It points in symbol to the death and resurrection of Christ, to the believer's death to sin, and spiritual rising to a new life ; and finally, we can hardly doubt (though this is less clearly presented in the New Testament) to the death and resurrection of the body. That Paul should be found connecting our baptism with the resurrection of the body could excite no surprise. On the contrary, the only wonder perhaps is, that there is not in all the compass of his writings a more express allusion to this particular aspect of the ordinance. Dr. Chase has not adduced, and we doubt if there is to be found (unless in the case before us) a single passage in which Paul distinctly links

baptism directly with the resurrection of the believer. Still we see no reason why it might not be, and we could not, therefore, we repeat, object to its assumption here on the ground of any intrinsic erroneousness of the idea ; rather we should certainly be prepared to find it in a discussion of the doctrine of the resurrection.

We repeat also (as in our former article) that we see no difficulty in deducing this idea from the brief and pregnant phrase used by the Apostle. The passage admits of these renderings—"baptised *ovre* the dead," "baptized *on behalf of* the dead," "baptized *in relation to* the dead." On the first rendering rested the idea entertained by some, that it referred to baptism over the graves of martyrs : on the second, the now so prevalent idea, that it refers to a custom of baptizing living persons for the benefit of dead ones : and the third will admit any of the special ideas which may be grouped under the general formula *in reference to, in relation to*. The first of these is now universally rejected. The second is by the ablest recent commentators generally received, and is that which the mere language of the text, apart from extrinsic considerations, most naturally suggests. But rejecting these two, and taking the preposition in its large and very usual sense of *in relation to, in reference to*, we are left to the claims of the context for determining the more specific idea which this large general relation will allow.* Let us then look again at the analysis of the context, and see what specific interpretation it demands.

* Dr. Chase's remark that the preposition *ὑπέρ* (here rendered *for*;) is used to signify not only *instead of, in the place of*, but also *respecting, or with reference to*, is erroneous only in its implication, that the natural and ordinary meaning of *ὑπέρ* is *instead of, in place of*. This certainly is far from being the case. Its natural meaning is *over*. Its next and by far most common meaning, both in the Classics and in the New Testament, is *on behalf of*. As an extension of this, it comes to mean not unfrequently *in relation to, in reference to*, and is then very nearly, though perhaps never quite, equivalent to *περί*. Its meaning of *instead of*, growing out of the meaning *on behalf of*, is rare, and we strongly doubt, with Meyer, whether there is a single thoroughly established instance of this use in the Greek Testament. There certainly is not in any of the passages which speak of Christ's dying for men.

Dr. Chase concurs with us in the general analysis of the passage. He, with us, divides it into two portions, a negative and a positive; the negative continuing to verse 20, where the Apostle, in contrast with the dark and cheerless view thus presented, turns around, and gives us the contrast in a glimpse of the positive aspects and effects of the resurrection, which runs on to verse 29. Here he returns and resumes the thread broken off at verse 19. Now in neither part, we venture to say, is there, strictly speaking, an argument. The one strain assures us that there *is* a resurrection of Christ, with all its glorious consequences: the other, that if the dead rise not it follows that Christ is not risen, and with this comes the utter extinction of Christian hope, and the utter folly and futility of Christian sacrifices. We may leave out of account the interposed positive portion from verse 20 to verse 29, and present the other parts in their connexion, as a continuous whole. They may be given about as follows:

1. If the dead rise not, Christ is not risen.
2. Then is our preaching vain, and your faith is vain.
3. Ye are yet in your sins.
4. They who have died trusting in Christ, have perished.
5. Christians in that case are the most miserable of men.
6. For in that case they will gain nothing (what will they do?) who are baptized for the dead. How utterly groundless and unrewarded their baptism for the dead!
7. And how senseless the hourly jeopardy in which we, the Apostles, stand; my own daily martyrdom; my contending with the wild beasts at Ephesus!
8. Better, rather than thus live, encompassed by suffering, peril and death, to adopt the Epicurean maxim, Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.

Now in this analysis of the line of thought, we wish to call attention to one point in which we differ from Dr. Chase, and from most of the commentators, but in which we think the deeply reflecting student will agree with us. It is on the reason why Christians are called, in case of the extinguishing of their Christian hope, the most miserable of men. It surely

is not (as we endeavored to show in our former article) merely, or chiefly, or at all, because of the disappointment of their high hopes of futurity, of the sad contrast between the splendid prospect and the wretched realization, that the Apostle pronounces Christians as, in that case, supremely unhappy. He has in view no such ideal unhappiness. He is rather thinking of their hard present lot, of that cup of bitterness which, on account of their allegiance to Christ, they are called to drink, of the hate and persecution, the suffering and death by which, as Christians, they are perpetually environed. It is surely *this* to which the Apostle has reference when he pronounces Christians, without a hope of futurity, the most miserable of men. All their prospects for the future are blighted, and they live lives of unrewarded present toil and sacrifice and deadly peril.

And this view is important to our argument. For the passage thus interpreted forms the transition from the preceding statement of the extinguishment of Christian hope by the denial of the resurrection, to the following statement of the consequent folly and absurdity of the Christian life of suffering. And thus interpreted, the whole passage contains two grand thoughts. First, the denial of the resurrection involves the denial of the resurrection of Christ, and with this an utter sweeping away of all the glorious truths and hopes of the Gospel. Second, if this be so, Christians become the most miserable of men, and all their sacrifices, sufferings, exposures to danger and martyrdom utterly unrewarded and senseless. Better adopt the maxim of the atheist, and live for the day in rioting and pleasure.

Now we ask the reader, in this train of thought what room is there for such a question as why are we baptized in the hope of the resurrection of the dead, if there be no resurrection? It is a thought perfectly proper, and not unweighty in its place, but it has no relevancy here. It is surely here an interloper, an intruder, breaking in upon the direct and natural course of the Apostle's thought, and a course of thought, we add, much more practical and important than this thought contains. For this is merely an argument from consistency

It merely tells the Corinthians that they are doing a very idle and inconsistent thing, a thing which admits no logical defence, in undergoing baptism for the resurrection, if there is no resurrection. But it is, after all, a perfectly harmless thing. They may as well be perpetrating that foolery, or indulging in that amusement, as any other. They may as well indulge themselves in the pastime of baptism as in eating and drinking, if they like it, and if the objection to it is that it is simply illogical and illusory. They are neither the worse nor the better off for this. How different this from the stern, weighty, practical thought of the preceding and following context—a thought based on the daily experience of the members of the primitive Church. ‘You take away our hope in Christ. Then of what avail our life of Christian toil and suffering? Why shall we thus cut ourselves off from all the enjoyments of life, and make ourselves the victims of a perpetual martyrdom? It is folly, it is madness. Let us abandon it, and yield ourselves to the pleasures of the passing hour!’

This single thought, thus commencing with verse 19, and resumed and carried through verses 30, 31, 32, *demands* in our judgment a corresponding interpretation of verse 29. It *settles the question* that the reference in that verse must be, not to the *logical inconsistency* of Christians’ being baptized for the resurrection, when there is no resurrection, but to the *practical folly* of their being baptized for the *dead*, of their giving themselves, in baptism, to *death*, when beyond it there is no resurrection. Is it difficult, then, to determine what is meant by being baptized for the *dead*? Why, the Apostle himself immediately explains it. Each subsequent expression settles its general import. “Standing in jeopardy every hour,” — “dying daily,” i. e., being in daily peril of death—fighting, at the hazard of life, with the wild beasts, whether brutes or heathen men, of Ephesus—each of these is a fruit, or a portion (according as you take ‘baptized’ literally or figuratively) of being baptized for the dead. Each of these is an illustration and an element of that grand folly of the Christian profession which pledges its votaries to an untimely and violent death, with no hope of

life beyond. We confess it amazes us that a solution of the difficulty of the passage so obvious, so near at hand, furnished by the Apostle himself in the striking and kindred phrases immediately following, should have escaped the notice of nearly all the interpreters. These phrases, in connection with the general train of thought, seem to establish clearly that the passage has a general reference to believers' exposing themselves to death, allying themselves to the grave, and thus perpetrating that great folly for which, without a resurrection, the Apostle declares there is no excuse.

While such we conceive must be the general import of the passage, its more exact explanation we conceive may be matter of doubt. Whether *baptize* is to be taken literally or figuratively may be a question. If literally, then *all* Christians are baptized *for*, on behalf of, with reference to, the dead, i. e., so as to belong to them, and as it were delivered over to them. If figuratively, then it may refer to those only who are overwhelmed, plunged into afflictions and sufferings for, with reference to, the dead, and may refer more immediately to martyrs. We will not now discuss this point. Whatever special explanation we adopt, there is no difficulty in finding in the phrase that general meaning of baptized 'with reference and into relation to the dead,' which brings it perfectly into harmony with the preceding statement that believers are the most miserable of men, and the illustrations of this sentiment which immediately follow. We wish to add that not only the connexion of the thought, but the connexion of the sentences indicates the same thing. "Why are they baptized for the dead? Why do also *we* stand in jeopardy every hour?" Is it possible to read these two sentences thus connected and not believe that there is in the Apostle's mind a closer connexion between them than such an interpretation as that of Dr. Chase supposes? that they do not in fact express closely related ideas, and that the one is not merely an exposition of, or regular advance upon, the other?

The citations of Dr. Chase from the Fathers are, all but one or two, to the general effect that baptism is a type of the resurrection of Christ, and a symbol also of the believer's own death

and resurrection. This, for Baptists at least, needs no confirmation. It is a part of our settled creed. And so far as the Fathers' explanation of the present passage is concerned, we need only remark, that the ablest and most judicious Biblical scholars find themselves perpetually coming into collision with the interpretations of the Fathers, and while they find them very valuable as helps, consider them by no means binding as authority. The differences of the ablest Greek interpreters from each other furnish but too abundant proof that they are entitled to no implicit adherence.

One word further. Our interpretation may seem to take from the passage that fulness of meaning which belongs to it under that advocated by Dr. Chase. It is there made to declare the favorite doctrine of the symbolical connection of the ordinance of baptism with the Christian resurrection. But we need not remind our readers, that after all, the meaning of each passage is determined properly by the scope of the argument, and also that we shall find truth enough in every passage when we have found all that fairly lies within the legitimate line of the author's discussion. When we have exhausted *that*, it will be time enough to wrest the passage from its connection, and see how much additional meaning may be injected into it when standing alone.

ARTICLE IX.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Discourses and Essays. By WILLIAM G. D. SHEDD. Andover: Warren P. Draper. 1862. 12mo., pp. 324.

These discourses and essays embody the results of patient and vigorous thinking. They also give evidence of wide reading and high culture. They combine, to an unusual degree, solidity and breadth of thought with rhetorical felicity and finish. The public estimate of their value is evinced by a call for a second edition. The first edition, it will be remembered, contained the able essay, first published in this Review, entitled, "Sin a Nature, and that Nature Guilt." Another essay in strict theological harmony with that, though treating of a widely different doctrine, the atonement, has been added to the present edition, reprinted from the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. This essay, like that on original sin, aims to rest its doctrine on certain fundamental principles ascertained by a careful mental and moral analysis. It presents views which the advocates of the rectoral or governmental theory of the atonement will not find it easy to dispose of. Both these essays, as well as the discourse on *The Method of Theological Studies*, are well worth reading by all who are occupied with theological inquiries.

Natural and Revealed Theology : A system of Lectures, embracing the Divine Existence ; authority of the Scriptures ; Scriptural Doctrine ; Institutions and Ordinances of the Christian Church. By JOHN J. BUTLER, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological School at New Hampton, N. H. Dover : Freewill Baptist Printing Establishment. 1861. 8 vols., pp. 456.

This is regarded by the Freewill Baptists as an authoritative exposition of their tenets. And they have been fortunate in their expounder; for though there be in the volume little evidence of original thinking or independent investigation, there is lucid and guarded statement, reverence for Scripture, and withal, enough of logic and system to serve

the practical purposes for which the volume was designed. The author affirms moral law to be "immutable and independent of the will of any being whatever. That benevolence is right and selfishness is wrong arise from no enactment or constitution of things." Decrees, "so far as they relate to moral beings, are conditioned, and founded on God's foreknowledge of the free acts of his accountable creatures." "Election to salvation is expressive of a fact, viz., that God saves those who comply with the terms he has proposed." Sin is selfishness, and depravity is both total and native; "all unregenerate men are totally depraved, in the sense that they are without holiness, and under the dominion of sin;" "every moral act, state and being, is either sinful or holy." Infants have a "corrupt propensity in them," which "is denominated their native depravity:" and yet man "has never lost ability to obey God" — all men have "the power of contrary choice" — there must be a "voluntary submission of the heart to God, or the sinner will never be regenerated." It is also affirmed to be "*possible* for the believer to fall away and perish." For further account of this volume see a preceding article in this No.

America before Europe. Principles and Interests. By COUNT AGENOR DE GASPARIN. Translated from advance sheets by MARY L. BOOTH. New York: Charles Scribner. 1862.

The most comprehensive and philosophical exposition of the government and institutions of the United States, ever yet given to the world, was made by a Frenchman. Now, after twenty years, when for the first time that government is in peril, the best treatise yet written in defence of its principles and conduct, is again from the pen of a Frenchman. Count de Gasparin merits the gratitude of the North, not only for the generous ardor with which he has espoused our cause, but for that accurate acquaintance with the history of our struggle, and that thorough comprehension of its moral and political antecedents, which alone could command the attention and influence the opinions of those watching the progress of events on this side of the water. He writes with the clear insight of one who understands the genius of our institutions; with the matured judgment of one who has taken into account the various internal forces of our social and political organizations; with the calm impartiality of one entirely removed from party or sectional strife, and with the free eloquence of one in full sympathy with a noble cause. His book is divided into six parts.

In Part I., he treats of the Attitude of Europe (alluding rather to peoples than to governments), showing that it has been one of indifference, coldness, and distrust toward the North. He says:

"We have invented for their use a complete political theory,—the first article of which is liberty of dismemberment. At the very moment when this friendly people in the plenitude of its right, declared that it would admit of no separation, we almost decided that it was at once legitimate in itself, necessary to Europe and beyond the possibility of suppression. To foresee events is in part to create them, and nothing has better aided the South than the prediction of its final triumph."

And again;

"This rebellion has boasted that it would force us to an adjustment, and compel us, willing or unwilling, to range ourselves on the side of the cotton merchants and slave dealers. Now what it proposed it executes, and what it hoped for it obtains. Docile Europe comes to its aid at the proper time; we demonstrate to ourselves that it is right; and not content with believing so ourselves, find it quite natural to ask Mr. Lincoln to think so likewise."

After showing what should have been the attitude of Europe, he finds the explanation of her present position in the fact that

"From the first moment Europe arrogated to herself a sort of benevolent patronage over divided America, she saw in it minors, children I should say, whom it was the duty of reasonable men to direct. Toward this republic, toward this imperilled confederacy, we did not feel ourselves bound to obey the laws applicable between States on a footing of equality. . . . If Europe had not believed herself called to lord over America, she would have remained faithful to her natural rôle, whatever might have been her theoretical previsions concerning the issue of the crisis, she would have known no government but that of the United States. She would have seen nothing in this civil war but a struggle between the regular government and rebels, a struggle between the adversaries and champions of the extension of slavery."

Count De Gasparin makes a powerful exhibition of the fact that the recognition of the South as belligerent has not only not proved neutrality, but has conferred on the South prodigious moral advantages. "To establish equality where it does not exist, is to serve the one, and to injure the other; to place a belligerent where there was a rebel, is to show one's self as far from neutral as is possible to imagine." But while Europe thus entered on a series of acts which necessarily had recognition for its extreme term, our author denies that she had in view the attainment of such an end, but only "an unavowed tendency or temptation." He thinks the name belligerent has been so explained as already to have lost all its injurious meaning. In the discussion of

this question of neutrality Count De Gasparin pays a tribute to our cabinet which we cannot forbear quoting.

"The attitude of the cabinet at Washington in the presence of so grave a difficulty, has been of a nature to conciliate universal esteem. Grieved without being violent; energetic without being aggressive; refusing to listen to despatches wherein the rebels were styled belligerents, yet not hesitating to acknowledge the amicable proceedings by which Europe has more than once redeemed the harshness of her official language, it has understood how to preserve its position on a great question of principle, and at the same time to avoid exaggerating it so far as to compromise the practical interests of the day."

He thinks that Europe has given valuable proof of real kindness to the United States in forbearing, from the outset, to elude the blockade.

Part II. treats more particularly of England. Very much was expected of that country.

"It was hoped with the more confidence that the Prince of Wales had scarcely quitted the American soil, where an enthusiastic welcome had appeared to seal the lasting forgetfulness of old quarrels. This confidence was such that deceived at the first moment, it was nevertheless persevered in with touching obstinacy. Men could not resign themselves to hearing no word of affection from beyond the seas. The day of peril had come, it was impossible that friends, kindred, and brethren should not take their part of this honorable distress, accepted for the service of humanity. They waited long; they long repeated to themselves that there was some mistake, that the nature of the conflict was not yet comprehended by England. At length it was necessary to yield to evidence. With icy sang-froid, the English nation signified to America that its struggle was of interest to no one; that the flag of slavery displayed by the South was revolting to no one; that the success of the South dismayed no one; that the dismemberment of the United States saddened no one."

But Count De Gasparin finds two nations in England. Selfish, unprincipled England, and liberal, Christian England. Among no people does he find policies so offensive in their selfishness; among none does he find such powerful reactions toward good. Already he discovers England repenting of and reforming her policy toward the United States. This unfriendly feeling he explains not alone by cotton and the tariff, but by the general desire, not distinguishing between Northern and Southern policies, to "chastise Yankee insolence;" by the strategy of the Palmerston party, and most of all by the fact that American institutions have for a long time been used as a formidable weapon against those of England; "in the failure of the American cause England saw the failure of Mr. Bright and the radical party."

A chapter on the Trent affair completes Part II. Part III. is devo-

ted to the enumeration and combating of certain errors credited in Europe, as that, 1st, Slavery is not really in question. 2d, We are before all to avoid civil war. 3d, The South had a right to secede. 4th, The South, though conquered, will not be brought back to the Union. 5th, The South will not be conquered. In Part IV., Count De Gasparin shows that the best interests of Europe are coincident with the highest prosperity of America; he treats briefly of a return to the old Colonial policy; of the Influence of Spain; of St. Domingo and Mexico. Part V. addresses wise words of encouragement and caution to Americans, and Part VI. Christian words to Christian people in America and England. The book closes with certain official documents furnished by Secretary Seward.

On opening to some of the impassioned passages of this book, it might be regarded as less the result of thought than of feeling. But Count De Gasparin has thought *until* he has felt. He has taken no cursory, superficial view for an ulterior purpose. He has canvassed the whole length and breadth of his subject, and examined it in its minutest details. His conclusions are based on wide and accurate information, and are drawn only after mature and well-digested thinking. The key-note of his book is found in one of "his oldest and most cherished convictions — the immense value of principles. There is no right against right — to practise justice, such is the only simple, luminous, effective, and truly useful policy." He writes with the honest, manly glow of one confident of his own uprightness, confident of the justness of the principles he maintains, and confident, too, of that deeper sense of honor and of right in his readers, to which he everywhere appeals. With the exception of an occasional infelicity or ambiguity, of which the title of the book furnishes at the outset a specimen, Miss Booth has translated as she always does, with faithfulness and skill.

Baptism the Covenant and the Family. By Rev. PHILIPPE WOLFF, late of Geneva, Switzerland. Translated freely from the French, by the Author, with some additions. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. 1862. 12mo., pp. 345.

This is a very curious book — a strange compound of the ludicrous and the serious; of absurdity and sense; of sophistry and argument; of actual perversion of history and of sharp criticism; of almost fanatical hate of the Baptists and yet of apparently honest zeal in behalf of Christianity. The author, on the 34th page, avows the following bold purpose: "We intend, therefore, to show that baptism by immersion

is a modern fiction borrowed from the heathen ; that neither John the Baptist nor the Apostles practised immersion ; that it was unknown to them. We will go even further, at the risk of being stigmatised as rash by our friends, and we will assert that immersion is no baptism. We will not even stop until we have proved it to be an indecency, the parody of a Christian institution, if not even a blasphemy." The book would hardly be worth further notice but for the high indorsement and commendation with which it is ushered before the public ; we shall therefore at another time furnish our readers with a further taste of its quality.

History of Friedrich the Second, commonly called Frederick the Great.

By THOMAS CARLYLE. In four volumes. Vol. III. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1862. 12mo., pp. 596.

No man has yet written history more graphically or truthfully than Mr. Carlyle. Grotesque as his imagery often is, and strange and un-English as his compounding of words may be, there is a distinctness of outline and vividness of coloring in his portraiture of characters, that never fail to hold the reader. Mr. Carlyle's hatred of "flunkeyisms" and "shams," and his hearty appreciation of genuineness and honesty, have in no degree abated since he wrote his *Sartor Resartus* and *History of the French Revolution*. His quick insight into character and his marvellous skill in its dissection, are here exhibited in a degree which himself even has never equalled. Rumor has attributed to him an almost incredible pains-taking in the accumulation of materials for the work, and one can hardly read a page of the narrative without discovering evidences of close scrutiny and careful sifting. Many old English opinions regarding Frederick are exploded, and important events are set in new light. The present volume covers four years, extending from the accession of Frederick to the throne of Prussia, in May, 1740, to the midsummer of 1844. One more volume, according to the author's original plan, is to complete the work, but, judging from the third, a fifth will have to be added.

The History of the Freewill Baptists for half a Century, with an Introductory Chapter. By Rev. I. D. STEWART. Vol. I., From the year 1780 to 1830. Dover : Freewill Baptist Printing Establishment. 1862.

The History of the Freewill Baptists has been little known outside of their own body. Neither their numbers, nor the attainments or

ability of their ministers, hitherto, have been such as to command general attention. But they constitute a body of whose origin, numbers, strength, doctrines, agencies and achievements, no intelligent Christian can afford to be ignorant. We have accordingly inserted in this No. an article furnishing the desired information. To that article we refer for the occasion and contents of this volume. Mr. Stewart has performed his task in a manner entirely creditable to himself, and doubtless satisfactory to his own denomination. It is not quite clear, however, why he should so decidedly prefer the term "Free Baptists" to the usual designation, "Freewill." "Free" is ambiguous, and fails to express the very tenet that gave rise to their existence and warrants its continuance.

God Timing all National Changes in the Interests of his Christ. A Discourse before the American Baptist Home Mission Society, at its Annual Meeting in the City of Providence, R. I., on Thursday Evening, May 11th, 1862. By WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS. New-York: Sheldon & Company. 1862.

Our readers have already heard so much of this admirable discourse, and it has been so generally read, that nothing now remains for us but to reiterate the general estimate of the justness of its sentiments and its singular fitness to the occasion which called it forth. It is distinguished, like everything else from its author, for its wealth of historical allusion and illustration, its abounding imagery and the fervor and vigor of its style and sentiment.

Life and Letters of Washington Irving. By his nephew PIERRE M. IRVING. Vol. II. New York: G. P. Putnam. 12mo., pp. 492.

The second volume of the *Life of Washington Irving* commences with the year 1820, and closes with his return to this country in 1832, after an absence of seventeen years. It includes a period of greater literary activity than any that preceded it. *Bracebridge Hall*, *Tales of a Traveller*, *The Life of Columbus*, and *The Conquest of Grenada* appeared during these twelve years. There is a peculiar, almost a sad interest in learning after so long a time what outward pressures and inward agitations called forth these blossoms of literature which seemed in their redolence to have sprung into life as spontaneously as violets or daisies.

This volume is made up for the most part of letters which the editor has connected and complemented with reserve and good taste. They are addressed to kindred and intimate friends to whom the writer freely confides the inward phases as well as outward incidents of his life. So completely do they mirror the man and the author, that after finishing them we seem rather to have formed a delightful friendship than to have been reading a book. But we reserve for the future a more extended tribute to this attractive work, only saying that Mr. Putnam has omitted nothing to make it one of the most elegant of its kind. We hope that many, during the coming holidays, will have the opportunity of admiring and enjoying it.

The Adventures of Philip on his Way through the World; showing who robbed him, who helped him, and who passed him by. By W. M. THACKERAY. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo., pp. 267.

"Philip" depends for its interest very little on intricacy of plot or startling adventure. We are prepared at the outset to look on Thackeray's characters somewhat as we look upon new neighbors, and the story, as it proceeds, engages us very much as would these neighbors served up in an after-dinner dish of gossip. But the dry wit and caustic humor of a not unkindly heart, will cause Philip and other of Thackeray's spun-out stories to be read with relish even to the last line.

THE REBELLION RECORD, edited by FRANK MOORE., and published by G. P. PUTNAM, continues its monthly appearance, always containing its two steel portraits of persons made famous by the war, and proving itself to be the most trustworthy, as it is also the only *complete* record of the rebellion.

THE AMERICAN BAPTIST ALMANAC FOR 1863 appears with its usual variety, including its annual register, frontispiece, and all.

Other notices are necessarily omitted.

ERRATA.

On page 6 of the January number of this vol. line 2, read "iiteral" for "ritual." p. 9, note, first line, read "liv" for "44." p. 13, line 12, read "Sickelmore" for "Lickelmore." p. 20, line 3, read "Brownist" for "Romanist." p. 22, line 3, read "Lydon" for "London." p. 23, line 6, read "early" for "only." p. 35, lines 9 *et ff.*, read "Aldermanbury" for "Aldennanbury." p. 40, line 5, read "justifying" for "qualifying."

INDEX TO THE TWENTY-SEVENTH VOLUME.

ABBOTT, JOHN S. C., his Practical Christianity, noticed, 347.

AIDS TO FAITH, noticed, 338, 506.

ALEXANDER, J. W., his Discourses on Faith, noticed, 506.

ARABIAN PHILOSOPHY, article on, 630; a people's philosophy has its root in their theology, 630-1; no monument of abstract thought attributable to the Arabs, previous to the time of Mohammed, 631; formation of religio-philosophical sects among, 632; whence the Arabs derived their first knowledge of Greek literature, 633, Arabic translations of Aristotle, 634; of Plato and other Greek writers, 635; Aristotle widely and eagerly studied, *ib.*: two centres of intellectual development among the Arabs, 636; their principal philosophies, *ib.*; Avicenna, *ib.*; Mosaic and heathen hypotheses of creation, 637; Avicenna's view, 638; his doctrine regarding the soul, 638-9; Algazel and the Apologetic school, 639-40; portion of Munck's analysis of Algazel's "Mutual Refutation," 641; natural sympathy between scepticism and mysticism, 641-2; his doctrine of the law of casuality, 643; he is accused of insincerity, *ib.*; practical effect of his works, 644; position of Averrhoes, *ib.*; historical sketch of, 645; intellectual and moral condition of Europe in the 12th century, 646-8; literary and scientific works of Averrhoes, 649; not the founder of a new system, but a commentator on Aristotle, 650; opinions current among the Mohammedan sects in his day, 651-2; Averrhoes' doctrine of creation, 653-4; mode of applying it to details, 655; the moving force does not act freely, 656; notions of Aristotle and Averrhoes essentially pantheistic, 657; theory of the universe, 657-9; of the intellect, 659-62; similiarity between Averrhoes and Coleridge, Cousin and the German Pantheists, 663;

need to beware of projecting modern opinions into ancient forms of expression, 664; reality and importance of the individuality of our entire thinking being, 665; doctrine of "union" between the sensible soul and the active intellect, 665-6; Pantheism the mere alphabet of abstract thought, 666.

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD, I Cor., xv: 29, article on, by Dr. Kendrick, 143; the passage and context re-translated, 144; translation justified, 145-6; RESUMÉ of interpretations, 147-8; the idea of a vicarious baptism widely and growingly prevalent, 149; Neander adopts reluctantly and with qualification, 150-1; the practice assumed intrinsically improbable, 152; not sustained by historical authority, 152-3; improbable precisely among the Corinthians, 154; inconceivable that Paul should have failed to censure, and even seemingly approved such a practice, 155; the argument itself a nullity, 156; the form of their question, "What will they do," &c., unsuited to this meaning, 157; also the context, 1858; the line of thought traced more particularly, 158-161; with which the interpretation in question has no connection or coherence, 162; what the line of thought does require, 163; logical consistency an important element in interpretation, *ib.*; some other interpretations excluded in the same way, 164; meaning of *ὑπερ*, 165; Bengel's explanation, *ib.*; Rosenmüller's, 166; the writer's own view, 166-7; not elaborate and far-fetched, 168; Paul not here proving the resurrection, 169.

—Article on, by Dr. Chase, 412; meaning of *ὑπερ*, 413 4; our Saviour brings distinctly to view the idea of a great contest between two parties, the Christian and the Anti-Christian, 415; those who were baptised thereby took part with Christ and his

friends, *ib.*; the resurrection of Christ assures that of his people, 416; Paul regarded a defence of the claims of Christ as virtually a defence of the resurrection of the dead, 417; was accustomed to connect the death and resurrection of Christ, 418-9; baptism has an impressive reference to both the death and resurrection of Christ, 420-2; the elements of our solution brought together, 423; Paul's course of thought, *ib.*; the writer's interpretation, 424; confirmed, substantially, by early writers in the Greek Church, 425-6; by distinguished writers in modern times, 427; the original form of baptism not impracticable in our northern climates, 428.

—Second article on, by Dr. Kendrick, 667; purpose of our former article, *ib.*; reference to the view of Dr. Chase, 668; force of *ὑπερ*, 669; analysis of context, 670; why Christians would, without the hope of immortality, be the most miserable of men, *ib.*; demands of context, 671-3; doubtful whether baptize is to be taken literally or figuratively, 673; the Fathers not binding as authority in Biblical criticism, 674.

BAPTISTS, THE FREEWILL; their history and doctrines, article on, 556; Benjamin Randall, the first preacher, 557; first church, 558; other early preachers, 559; progress of the sect, prior to 1790, 560; open communion *ib.*; washing of feet, *ib.*; quarterly meetings, 561; name of Freewill Baptist assumed, *ib.*; first church in Vermont, *ib.*; death of Mr. Randall, 562; churches organized in various States, 562-3; ecclesiastical polity the growth of circumstances, 564; origin and authority of the General Conference, *ib.* (also, 567); numerical increase during the first 50 years, *ib.*; trials and losses, 565; excitability in early history, *ib.*; ministers' salaries, 566; female preachers, *ib.*; publications, *ib.*; Sabbath schools, 567; written sermons, 568; Foreign Missions, *ib.*; the temperance question, 569; Home Mission Society, *ib.*; honorary titles, 570; slavery, *ib.*; ministerial education, 571; union with the Freewill Baptists, 572; statistics in 1860, 573; doctrines, 574-83.

BAPTISTS, The Place of in Protestant Christendom, article on, 517; necessity of a careful investigation, 518; two methods of inquiry open to us,

519; chief difficulty, *ib.*; Protestantism different from Reformation, 520; what the Reformers did in becoming Protestants, 521-2; sanctity of the Christian conscience the *primum mobile* of Protestantism, 523; authorities in favor of this view, *ib.*; this principle liable to abuse, 524; imperial authority of Scripture the necessary complement of, 524-5; the fundamental principle of Protestantism the fundamental principle of Baptist Christianity as such, 526; the Baptist conception of freedom of conscience broader and more complete than that of the first Reformers, *ib.*; origin of modern Baptists explained, 527; their distinguishing feature, 528; not strictly doctrinal but ecclesiastical, 529; yet has doctrinal basis, 530; the practice of Protestants belied the principle of their being, 531; past and present position of Baptists in Protestant Christendom defined, 531-2; true idea of the unity of the Church, 533-4; responsibilities of our vanward position, 535-6.

BAPTISTS, EARLY MODERN in their Relations to Pædo-baptists, article on, 1; difficult to trace the history of a denomination before it has attained a clear and recognized form, 1-2; organization of Baptists, all that belongs to modern times, 3; rejection of infant baptism the great distinction of Baptists, 4; primitive form of the rite, 5-7; infant baptism not even known in the early church, 8; dissenters not organized into the churches till the Reformation, 9; less occasion for separate church organizations in England, prior to the 14th century, 10; the separation gradual, 11-13; attitude of the English government towards Baptists during the civil troubles, 14; act of uniformity, 15; Baptists among the separated Puritans, 16-18; the first Independent church in London, 19; Neal's account, 20; cannot be accepted, 21; Crosby's preferable, 22; connection of this church with the Baptists, 23; first English Baptist church, 24; Baptist views among the American colonists, 25; first Calvinistic Baptist church in London, 26; formation of other Baptist churches in London, 27-9; Mr. Jessey's change of views on the baptism, 30; first close communion church, 31; its relation to the original Independent church, *ib.*; othe

- Baptist churches in London, 32-5, number at the middle of the 17th century, 36; reasons for their rapid multiplication, 36-40; character of their ministry and membership, 41-3.
- BAYNE, PETER, his Testimony of Christ to Christianity, noticed, 508.
- BIOGRAPHY, RECENT MINISTERIAL, article on, 284; biography, next to theology, the noblest of studies, *ib.*; specially valuable to the Christian minister, 285; ministry and character of Alexander Carlyle, 286-7; Daniel Wilson, 288-90; John Angell James, 291-2; James W. Alexander, 293-5; thoughts suggested in review of the labors of these men, 296; importance of thorough preparation for the work of the ministry, 296-8; value of hard study in the work of the ministry, 299-304.
- BONAR, HORATIUS, his Hymns of Faith and Hope, noticed, 347; his God's Way of Peace, *ib.*
- BROWN, DR. JOHN, his Lay Sermons on Health, noticed, 348.
- BUNNETT, FANNY ELIZABETH, her Louise Juliane Electress Palatine and her Times, noticed, 511.
- BUNTING, JABEZ, Volume of Sermons by, noticed, 509.
- BURTON, RICHARD F., his City of the Saints, noticed, 512.
- BUTLER, PROF. JOHN J., his Natural and Revealed Theology, noticed, 675.
- CAREY AND HIS COADJUTORS, article on, 595; birth and early life of Carey, *ib.*; his first public ministrations, 596; his immersion, 597; ministry at Barton, *ib.*; marriage, *ib.*; prosecutes his studies amidst great poverty, *ib.*; pastorate at Moulton, 598; efforts to awaken an interest in behalf of the heathen, *ib.*; missionary society formed, 599; moral condition of the world at that time, *ib.*; Carey, the pioneer of modern missions, 600; opposition to the enterprise, 601; the society determine to send Carey and Dr. John Thomas to Bengal, 602; obstacles, 603; missionaries arrive at Calcutta, *ib.*; trials, 604; arrival of other missionaries, *ib.*; removal to Serampore, *ib.*; Bible published in Bengalee, 605; professed conversion, *ib.*; baptism of Krishnu Pal, 606; apostolic simplicity of the missionaries, *ib.*; Sidney Smith's assault on the enterprise, 607; Wilberforce attempts to secure a legal toleration for the missions in India, *ib.*; bitter opposition, 608; real cause of, *ib.*; self-denial and devotion of Carey and his associates, 609; ungenerous criticisms, 610; abolition of wife-burnings, 611; the missionaries attempt to break up the system of caste, 612; they establish a charity school, *ib.*; introduce various improvements of civilization, *ib.*; Carey's love of flowers, *ib.*; college founded, 613; literary labors, *ib.*; trials, 614; Carey, Marshman and Ward adapted to each other, *ib.*; their death, 615; touching memories of the Serampore mission, *ib.*
- CARLYLE, THOMAS, his History of Frederick the Great, noticed, 680.
- CATLIN, GEORGE, his Breath of Life noticed, 179.
- CHINESE PRETENDER, The Religious System of the, article on, 305; human development and progress under the control of law, 306; Christ the end of the law, 307; preparation among the Gentiles for the gospel of Christ, 308; early life of Siu-tshuen, 309-10; sickness and visions of, 311; opinions as to the source of these fantasies, 312; as to the physical cause of his intellectual transformation, 313-14; engages in teaching, 315; reads Christian books and embraces with joy the doctrines of regeneration, &c., 316; changes views on baptism, 317; regards himself specially commissioned to teach the new doctrines, *ib.*; change of doctrine and personal claims, 318; converts multiply rapidly, 319; the Kwang-si district, where the rebellion originated, *ib.*; zeal of Siu-tshuen and his co-laborers, 320; writes odes and discourses on religious topics, 321; first indication of his purpose to effect the civil redemption of his nation, *ib.*; receives the instruction of Mr. Roberts, 322; converts very numerous, 323; form of worship and mode of receiving candidates, *ib.*; the Pretender boldly attacks idolatry, 324; goes to Kwang-si, 325; origin and progress of the rebellion, 326-7; Siu-tshuen proclaimed Emperor, 328; accounts of visits to the Emperor, by Rev. Griffith John, 329-30; by Rev. J. S. Holmes, 331-2; by Rev. Mr. Roberts, 333; civil and religious significances of the movement, 334-6.
- CLEVELAND, CHARLES DEXTER, his Compendium of Classical Literature, noticed, 178.
- COOLIE TRADE, The Chinese, article on, 211; origin, *ib.*; a mercantile enterprise, 212; profits and losses of the

- business, 213-17; the trade fairly started in 1850, 217; for a time things went on swimmingly, 218; action of various governments, 219; the trade diverted into other channels, 220; it receives a serious check from within, *ib.*; character of those engaged in, 221; condition of Coolies in Cuba compared with that of the slaves, 222. fraud and iniquity of the contracts with the Coolies, 223-6; frauds and outrages connected with the traffic at Swatow, 227-30; traffic at Macao, 231-4; efforts of the Coolies to regain their freedom, 235; tragedies at sea, *ib.*; traffic condemned by the Chinese authorities, 236; deplorable effect of the traffic in alienating the Chinese, 237; new movement inaugurated by the British Government in 1860, 238.
- CUMMING, JOHN, his Teach us to Pray, noticed, 509.
- DANA, A. H., his Ethical and Physiological Inquiries, noticed, 346.
- DAVIDSON, ROBERT, his Elijah, and other Poems, noticed, 178.
- DEAD, THE RIGHTEOUS, Between Death and the Resurrection, article on, 239; the Bible contains no formal and explicit account of, 240; different theories, 241; the Scriptural view is, 1, that they are in an intermediate state or condition, *ib.*; a certain indefinite period intervenes between their death and bodily resurrection, 242; during which they continue to exist, 243; in a condition different from what it was on earth, or will be after the resurrection, *ib.*; 2, this state one of conscious existence, 244; implied in the use of the Hebrew *rapha*, *ib.*; in necromancy, *ib.*; Job teaches, 245; the rich man and Lazarus, *ib.*; the transfiguration, 246; Paul teaches, *ib.*; visions of John, *ib.*; objections considered, 248; 3, this state connected with locality, 249-50; 4, they are in that portion of the underworld called Paradise, and also in close proximity to Jesus, 251; Sheol and Hades, *ib.*; reply of Christ to the dying thief, 252-3; passages indicating proximity to Christ, 254-6; this view harmonizes apparently conflicting statements, 257; objection considered, 258; 5, this state one of blessedness, 259; not of glory, 259-60.
- DEMOCRACY ON ITS TRIAL, article on, 94; character of the charge preferred against our republic, *ib.*; English reform not the fruit of American example, 95; fate of the republic yet undecided, 96; the argument against democracy, 97; the protective policy had a Southern origin, 98-9; Calhoun's position in regard to, 100-1; his opinion that all governments tend to tyranny, 102; liberty substructed by slavery, aristocratic, 103; Bill of Abominations, *ib.*; nullification, 104; spread of the heresy, 104-5; slavery agitation thrust upon us as a new basis for opposition to democracy, 106-9; Calhoun's method for restoring the equilibrium of the two sections, 110; every form of government imperilled in its administration by men, 111; the vital questions always moral, 112; tyranny of majorities a pure impossibility, 113-4; what we have a right to expect from England, 115; dictatorship the instinctive refuge of republics, 116.
- DENNISON, MRS. MARY A., The Master, noticed, 516.
- DORNER, DR. J. A., his History of the Development of the Doctrine and Person of Christ, noticed, 174.
- ELLICOTT, PROF. C. J., his Lectures on the Life of Christ, noticed, 173; his Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, noticed, 340.
- GASPARIN, COUNT DE, his America before Europe, noticed, 676.
- GIESELER, DR. JOHN C. L., his Text-Book of Church History, noticed, 176.
- GREEN, WILLIAM HENRY, his Grammar of the Hebrew Language, noticed, 172.
- GUTHRIE, DR. THOMAS, his Way to Life, noticed, 508.
- HAGENBACH, DR. K. R., revised edition of his Text-Book of the History of Doctrines, noticed, 343.
- HARPER'S Hand-Book for Travellers in Europe and the East, noticed, 513.
- HOPKINS, SAMUEL, his history of The Puritans, noticed, 176.
- INSPIRATION OF THE APOSTLES, article on, from the German of Steudel, 67; would even the fundamental doctrines of Christianity be secured as truth by the theory of Elwart? 67; objections to the rule of discrimination required by this theory, *ib.*; without exegetical foundation, 68; impracticable by reason of man's sinful disposition, *ib.*; leads to contradictory results, 69-70; allegiance to the word of Scripture not proven impracticable by differences of interpretation, 71-3; not inconsistent with the presence of figurative language

- in Scripture, 74; does not forbid dogmatic theology to adapt its form of thought to that of its own time, 75; can safe criteria for separating the form from the essence of Christian truth be given, 76; conceptions of the understanding do not belong to the form, 77; the truth communicated by the Holy Spirit not falsified by entering the mind of one who shares the opinions of his age, 78-81; the substance of truth not impaired by assuming different forms, 82-3; true limits of form, 84; form shaped by the truth, and not truth by the form, 85-6; alleged errors in the writings of the Apostles, 87-91: false interpretation of *τὸ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει*, 92; results of our investigation, 93.
- INTELLIGENCE, Foreign Theological and Literary, 180.
- IRVING'S Works, national edition of, noticed, 178. Life and Letters, noticed, 511, 682.
- JEPHTHAH, VOW AND SACRIFICE OF, article on, 377; three principal interpretations, 378; arguments for the view that the vow contemplated a bloody offering, 379; evident that Jephthah intended to devote a human being as a thanksgiving to God, 380-1; the *vows* here to be taken disjunctively, 382-4; proofs that the vow did not contemplate a bloody offering, 385-91; women as well as men accustomed to devote themselves to the service of the sanctuary, 392-3; functions discharged by them in that position, 393-4.
- LACORDAIRE, LE PERE, article on, 429; greatness of our loss in his death, 430; Montalembert's first interview with, 431; his conversion, 432; extracts from his speeches when defending himself before the criminal court in 1832, 432-5; solitary life in Paris and first attempts at preaching, 436; preaching at Notre-Dame, 437; extemporizing had much to do with his success, 438; general character as a man, 439; Montalembert's eulogy on, 440; Lacordaire's farewell to the metropolitan pulpit, in 1851, 441; the writer's recollections of him, 442-4.
- LANGE, PROF. J. P., his Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew, noticed, 172.
- LIBERAL THEOLOGY, American, Phases of, article on, 616; the development and status of such a theology not singularities in the history of opinions, *ib.*; producing causes, 617-18; primary basis the rejection of the divinity of Christ, 618; progress of the sect under the leadership of Channing, *ib.*; its decline during the last 25 years, 620; accounted for, 621; the second phase went beyond ultrarationalism, 622; R. W. Emerson, *ib.*; Parker, the leader of the new phase, 623; his position, 624; character of his followers, *ib.*; Parkerism rapidly passing away, 625; attempts of Old School Unitarianism to gain a closer affiliation with orthodox Christianity, *ib.*; Dr. Bellows' attempt to inaugurate a Broad Church, 626; the truth benefitted by American Liberalism, 627-9.
- LITERATURE IN DEBT TO LIFE, article on, 537; educated men in America obliged to mix actively with life, 538; this necessity how aided and compensated, 539-41; literature a product and exponent of life, 542; language, the instrument and conservator of literature, is a creature of life, 543; life itself only a sublimer literature, 544; literature indebted to life for its material and inspiration, 545-6; the charm of the classics, 547; the use of literature, *ib.*; prospects of literature opening out of our national struggle, 548-9; literature also ministers to life, 550; literature, to live, must be useful, *ib.*; Mr. Buckle's estimate of literature, 551; it is life that is to save literature, 552-4; neither life, nor literature yet exhausted, 555.
- LYTTON, SIR E. BULWER, his Strange Story, noticed, 348.
- MACDONALD, DONALD, his Introduction to the Pentateuch, noticed, 170.
- MACLAY, B. S., his Life among the Chinese, noticed, 345.
- M'COSH, JAMES, his Supernatural in Relation to the Natural, noticed, 339.
- MARSH, G. P., his Lectures on the English Language, noticed, 177.
- MAYHEW, HENRY, his Young Benjamin Franklin, noticed, 348.
- MEMORIAL VOLUME of the First Fifty Years of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, noticed, 177.
- MILL, JOHN STUART, his Considerations on Representative Government, noticed, 514.
- MONTALEMBERT, COUNT DE, his Monks of the West, reviewed, 44; sketch of Montalembert, 44-6; history and design of his present work, 47; character and purpose of monastic life,

48; origin of, 49; early manifestations of the ascetic tendency, 50; introduction of monachism into Europe, 51; rapid progress in the middle of the 5th century accounted for, 52-3; position at the close of the 5th century, 54; Benedict of Nursia, *ib.*; his *Sancta Regula*, 55; the cœnobite societies converted into a comprehensive monastic order, 56; Gregory the Great aids in advancing the order, 57; rival of the Benedictine rule, 58; triumph of the latter, 59; missionary movements of the monks in the 7th century, *ib.*; ecclesiastical position of the monks, 60-1. their services to Christendom, 63-6;

MORAL INFLUENCE, Laws of, article on, 394; man influenced, according to established laws, 395; classification, 396; the person who is to persuade, must possess, and be understood to possess, a competent knowledge of his subject, *ib.*; must be, and have the name of being, a good man, *ib.*; honest and earnest in his particular department of labor, 397; the persons to be persuaded must be interestedly attentive, 398; must have confidence in the teacher, 398-9; only correct statements and sound arguments are to be relied upon, 400; the manner should be suited to those addressed, 401; to time and place, 402; should be persuasive, *ib.*; the speaker should be fair, 403; plain, 404; earnest, *ib.*; persevering, 405; a writer or speaker cannot rely on the mere power of truth, 406; absurdity of certain methods of moral influence, 407; want of success of some men easily accounted for, 408; the subject commended to the moral reformer, 409; to the minister of the Gospel, 410-11.

MORAL CONFLICT OF HUMANITY (Rom. viii: 14-25), article on, 471; nature of the conflict, 471-2; set forth by Paul in this passage, 473; different interpretations, 473-4; Paul shows the necessity and adequateness of the Gospel, 475; vindicates the law, 476; instrumentality of the law in the production of sin, 477-8; Paul alludes to the scenes enacted in Paradise, as illustrating the principle, 479-80; man the blind slave of sin, 481; conscience and reason see and approve the right, but are powerless, 482-4; the remedy, 485; the portraiture belongs not to the Christian but to the unregenerate, 486; the

Christian not the helpless thrall of sin, 487-8; in what sense the passage applicable to the Christian, 489; differs widely from I Cor. iii. and Gal. v; 16-19, 490; in his own personal experience Paul records the experience of humanity, 491; force of the phrase, "It is no more I," &c., 492; "I delight in the law of God," &c., 493-4; "with the mind I myself serve the law of God," &c., 495; natural that Paul should speak so definitely of the law, 496; and that his representation should be tinged with his Christian consciousness, 497; the next chapter presents a contrast to this delineation, 498; our interpretation does not degrade the passage, 499; this struggle of humanity intensified by the revealed law, 500-1; this view does not favor Pelagianism but Calvinism, 502.

MORTIMERS, THE LAST OF THE, noticed, 516.

MULLER, MAX, his Lectures on the Science of Language, noticed, 514.

MUSSEY, DR. R. D., — Health: its Friends and its Foes, noticed, 515.

OLMSTED, FREDERICK LAW, his Cotton Kingdom, noticed, 344.

PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS, article on, 349; decree of the council of Trent, *ib.*; Protestants not very unequally divided, 350; the doctrine defined, *ib.*; proper method of viewing the subject, 351-2; the doctrine argued from regeneration, 353; from pardon, 354; attested by Christ, 355-6; by the apostles, 357; final salvation represented as inseparably connected with those things which constitute the Christian character, 358; proofs from the Old Testament, 359-61; objections considered, 361; salvation of believers conditional, 362-3; exhortations and warnings of Scripture, 364; consequences of apostasy declared, 365-8; actual instances given in Scripture, 369-70; objection from moral tendency, 371; from observed cases of apostasy, 372-3; views of prominent Arminian writers, 374; evil tendency of the opposite doctrine, 375-6.

POWER, PHILLIP BENNETT, his "I Wills" of Christ, noticed, 507.

PSALMS, the Book of, in Hebrew and English, noticed, 342.

PULPIT, POWER IN THE, article on, 118; in grace, as in nature, a general connection between the means and the end, 119; conditions of power in the pulpit, in its human

- aspect, *ib.*; there must be Scripture truth, 120; vigorous thought, 121; the two great doctrines, man a sinner, and Christ a Saviour, must be much dwelt upon, 122; pulpit power affected by the composition of a sermon, 123; plainness, simplicity and directness the prime qualities, *ib.*; reasons why some men are not plain, 124; Christ the plainest preacher in the world, 125; method, 126; attractiveness, 127; the eloquence needed for this age, 128; delivery, 129-30; successful speaking depends on the man, 131; must possess goodness, 132; knowledge, *ib.*; courage, 133. experience, 134; industriousness, 135; sympathy, 136; enthusiasm, 137; earnestness, *ib.*; passion, 138; must be a man of prayer, 139; faith, 140; holiness, 141-2.
- REBELLION RECORD, noticed, 343, 511.
- RESURRECTION, THE FIRST, and the Millennium, in Rev. xx: 1-6, article on, 445; prevalence and nature of Chiliasm, *ib.*; objection to this theory, 446; Scriptures usually adduced in its support, 446-7; counter-passages, 448-51; the figurative interpretation of Rev. xx: 1-6, unsatisfactory, 452; the subject one of practical and void importance, 453-4; interpretation required by a fair exegesis, 455; this prophecy a vision, *ib.*; has Christ bound Satan? 456-7; objection to the view proposed, 458; exegetical demands of the passage do not require that Satan should have been shut up and sealed in the abyss at Christ's death, 459; the period of the vision not a literal 1,000 years, 460-1; but a definite period of time corresponding to Christ's mediatorial reign, 462: first resurrection defined, 462-5; objection considered, 466-8; a possible connection with subsequent context, 469-70.
- RICE, N. L., his Sermons on our Country and the Church, noticed, 177.
- SABBATH, THE CHRISTIAN, Discourses on, by N. L. Rice and others, noticed, 507.
- SEISS, JOHN A., his Discourses on the Parable of the Ten Virgins, noticed, 508.
- SCIENCES, GROWTH AND RELATIONS of the, article on, 185; intimate relations of mind and matter, *ib.*; works of Dr. Whewell, 186; difficulty of his task, 187; what is science, 188-90; laws of matter not deducible from necessary principles, 191; genesis of scientific inquiry, 182.3; method of constructing intellectual philosophy, 194; ethics and polity, 195; origin of mechanical philosophy, 196; laws of mechanics, 197; astronomy, 198; optics, acoustics, 199; relation of mathematical sciences to physical inquiry, 200-3; nature and importance of Chemistry, 204-5; Mineralogy, 205; Geology, *ib.*; fossil Zoology, 206; fossil Botany, *ib.*; relation of each science with all the others, 207; truth of the paradox, the more we know, the more we are impressed with the limits of our capacity, 208-9; paradoxes everywhere, 210.
- SLAVERY, Does the Bible Sustain, article on, 584; revelation objective and subjective distinguished, 585-6; the principles of Hebrew servitude involve, in their development, the overthrow of the system, 587; Jewish practice sustains this theoretical truth, 588; slavery not formally condemned in the New Testament, 589-90; its destruction involved in the legitimate development of New Testament principles, 591-2; Paul's return of Onesimus, 503; Christianity and slavery cannot permanently dwell together, 594.
- SHEDD, WILLIAM G. T., his Discourses and Essays, noticed, 675.
- STANLEY, PROF. A. P., his Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, noticed, 174, 510.
- STEVENS, DR. ABEL, his History of Methodism, noticed, 342.
- STUART, MOSES, revised edition of his Commentary on Ecclesiastes, noticed, 341.
- TAYLOR, ISAAC, his Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, noticed, 505.
- TRACTS for Priests and People, noticed, 337.
- TRENCH, DEAN, his Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches, noticed, 171.
- TROLLOPE, ANTHONY, his North America, noticed, 513.
- VASSAR, JOHN GUY, his Twenty Years around the World, noticed, 344.
- WEDGWOOD, HENSLEIGH, his Dictionary of English Etymology, noticed, 346.
- WELLS, DAVID A., his Annual of Scientific Discovery, noticed, 516.
- WESTCOTT, BROOKE FOSS, his Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, noticed, 504.